



Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 16, 1957

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, as so often in days whose record is now written, we pause in reverence at the footstool of Thy grace with a sense of our failure and fallibility, we come with the deep prayer that the great causes that will mold the future into the pattern of Thy desire and design, that will heal the world and rebuild it and usher in a just and abiding peace, may challenge the best that is in us and gain the supreme allegiance of our love and labor as we serve our brief day. To this end, may our spirits be as candles of the Lord which no darkness can put out. We ask it in the ever-blessed name of that Holy One whose life is the light of men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 15, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, May 16, 1957, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 120. An act for the relief of James F. Walsh;

S. 394. An act to waive the limitation on the time within which a Medal of Honor may be awarded to Comdr. Hugh Barr Miller, Jr., United States Navy;

S. 998. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1953 (67 Stat. 41), and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate the third Friday of May of each year as National Defense Transportation Day.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7441) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7441) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement for the information of the Senate. In addition to the bills and other measures which I announced yesterday as cleared for consideration today, there are six other measures which are cleared at the present time, and which may be acted upon if there is no objection. They are the following:

Calendar No. 232, Senate Resolution 124, citing Edward A. Hintz for contempt of the Senate;

Calendar No. 304, Senate bill 534, to amend section 702 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to authorize the construction, reconstruction, or remodeling of vessels under the provisions of such section in shipyards in continental United States;

Calendar No. 305, Senate bill 886, to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation;

Calendar No. 306, Senate bill 1446, to amend title 14, United States Code, so as to provide for retirement of certain former members of the Coast Guard Reserve;

Calendar No. 307, Senate bill 1806, to amend the Sockeye Salmon Fishery Act of 1947; and

Calendar No. 321, Senate bill 763, to designate the east 14th Street highway bridge over the Potomac River in the District of Columbia, as the Rochambeau Memorial Bridge.

With respect to the last-mentioned bill, I may state that the committee is anxious to have it receive early consideration by the Senate, inasmuch as it is the desire of the Government officials concerned that the dedication of the bridge occur during the forthcoming visit by the President of France.

Again, Mr. President, I should like to remind the Senate that on tomorrow the

Senate will convene at 11 a. m., and will consider Calendar No. 309, House bill 6700, the Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriation bill.

I should also like to inform the Senate that the majority leader, who scheduled this proposed legislation, is ready and anxious to have the Senate proceed with consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill. He is prepared to ask the Senate to hold a session on Saturday, if necessary, in order to dispose of that appropriation bill. However, it is necessary for some of our colleagues to be away from the Senate on Saturday, because of longstanding engagements. Of course, in line with the spirit which prevails in the Senate, we endeavor to accommodate such Senators. Furthermore, under the rule it is necessary for the supplemental appropriation bill and the hearings and the report on it to be available 3 days before the bill is considered by the Senate; and any Senator can object to having the bill considered before it has been available for 3 days. A member of the minority has informed me that he would object to a request to take up the bill sooner than that. Therefore, the earliest day on which it will be possible for the Senate to consider the bill will be the coming Monday.

Mr. President, I do not wish to read in the newspapers that the administration is criticizing the leadership for a lag. I may say that last week I asked the clerk of each standing committee to attempt to have the chairman of his committee bring to the attention of the members of the committee each and every one of the 148 recommendations the Executive has sent to the Congress during this session. Although I realize that all of them cannot be acted upon, let alone be acted upon favorably, and prudence would not justify such a course, nevertheless I wish to be sure that at this session each recommendation that is made by the Executive does receive the earnest, sympathetic, and fair consideration of the committee concerned. Next week I plan to call a meeting of the chairmen of the standing committees, to ask them to give me their reports on the number of recommendations on which they have acted, their statements regarding when the others will be acted upon, and the time schedules.

Mr. President, I realize that we are approaching a time of the year when a great many graduation exercises will be held. Senators have been selected to receive honorary degrees and to deliver graduation addresses, and Senators must campaign for reelection. This is a very fertile time of the year in which to do so. However, the Senate has ahead

of it a majority of the appropriation bills, which must be acted upon between the present time and June 30, and the Senate also has a large number of Presidential recommendations upon which to act. I state to the Senate that we shall do everything we possibly can to accommodate Senators. There will not be a session of the Senate on Saturday of this week; but it may be necessary to have the Senate in session more days next week and more days the following week, as compared with the number of days of the week during which it has been necessary for the Senate to be in session in the past. Our schedule in that respect will depend upon how speedily action is taken by the Appropriations Committee.

So far as the leadership is concerned, we are prepared to have the Senate hold a session next Saturday and to have the Senate consider the supplemental appropriation bill. Its consideration has been delayed until Monday only because we have been informed that a Senator on the minority side stated that he would object to its earlier consideration.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees or subcommittees were authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate:

The Committee on Foreign Relations;
The Public Roads Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works; and
The Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A. M. ON FRIDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until tomorrow, Friday, at 11 a. m.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of William M. Johnson, to be postmaster at Granite City, Ill., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

J. Sinclair Armstrong, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, vice William B. Franke.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

C. Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the term of 5 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senate consider first Calendar No. 494, the nomination of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, because I understand there will be some discussion of Calendar No. 493. Therefore, I should like to have the other nominations acted on first, so that I may make some other plans, while that debate is taking place.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that Calendar No. 493 be temporarily passed over, and that at this time the Senate begin with Calendar No. 494, in considering the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and Calendar No. 494 will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Roger Charles Ernst, of Arizona, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

GOVERNOR OF ALASKA

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Michael A. Stepovich, of Alaska, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Andrew Parker, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for a term expiring March 3, 1962.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Vice Adm. Maurice E. Curtis to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of admiral while performing certain duties.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE NAVY AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy and in the Marine Corps.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy and Marine Corps be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, the Senate will have the usual morning hour, for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business; and in that connection I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at the conclusion of the morning hour, we plan to have the Senate resume the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination of Mr. Elmer F. Bennett, of Colorado, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EXEMPTION FROM PROHIBITIONS AGAINST CERTAIN TEACHERS IN CANAL ZONE

A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to exempt certain teachers in the Canal Zone public schools from prohibitions against the holding of dual offices and the receipt of double salaries (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to March 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF HOUSING AUTHORITY OF CITY OF CHARLESTON, S. C.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the Housing Authority of the City of Charleston, S. C., Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated April 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the period ended December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT ON TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SGT. JOHN F. BAUGHMAN

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Sgt. John F. Baughman (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 124

"Resolution relative to the land use program for the lower Colorado River

"Whereas the Parker Dam County Recreation District has been created in San Bernardino County comprising in its entirety land owned by the United States; and

"Whereas the United States Department of the Interior has under consideration at the present time numerous proposals which would affect the use of the land along the Colorado River below Parker Dam; and

"Whereas such proposals would, in their present form, adversely affect the administration of said lands by the Parker Dam County Recreation District; and

"Whereas said district is authorized under the laws of this State to lease or otherwise acquire control of all or any of the land in the district from the United States upon such terms as may be mutually agreed upon by the trustees of the district and the United States, and to, in turn, rent or sublease any of such land to any person for any purpose, recreational or otherwise, not inconsistent with the terms of the lease or other agreement under which the district holds the land under the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Congress of the United States and the United States Department of the Interior are respectfully memorialized to give consideration to leasing or giving con-

trol to the Parker Dam County Recreation District the lands located within the boundaries of said district and that the department be requested to take no action with respect to land use which will affect the operation of said district; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Whereas through Federal grant-in-aid programs the Federal Government by extravagant and unnecessary spending is forcing New Hampshire also to spend extravagantly to match and thus obtain back part of its own money; and

"Whereas New Hampshire citizens pay income taxes which go to Washington and are returned in part to New Hampshire under Federal grant-in-aid programs in amounts reduced by bureaucratic overhead, creating the false impression that the State is getting something for nothing; and

"Whereas in returning funds to New Hampshire the Federal Government ties strings to the use of these funds which interfere with local government, complicates the enactment of State legislation and forces the State to spend in fields it believes unwarranted; and

"Whereas it is common knowledge that local projects financed in part by Federal funds usually cost excessively because of unnecessary Federal requirements; and

"Whereas the New Hampshire Legislature feels that its citizens know better than the Federal Government how to spend the citizens' money and that local governments are more capable and efficient than the Federal Government in managing local programs; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the New Hampshire Legislature in the 1957 session assembled—

"1. That the Federal Government refrain from enacting new grant-in-aid programs and reexamine all such existing programs and end or reduce their costs wherever possible.

"2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member from New Hampshire in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States.

"3. That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the legislature of the other 47 States for their information and consideration by the clerks of the senate and house of representatives of the State of New Hampshire.

"Senator PAUL G. KARKEVELAS,
"Sponsor.

"ERALSEY C. FERGUSON,
"President of the Senate.

"W. DOUGLAS SCAMMAN,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"BENJAMIN F. GREER,
"Clerk of the Senate.

"GEORGE T. RAY, Jr.,
"Clerk of the House."

A resolution adopted by the Commissioners of Roads and Revenue, Glynn County, Brunswick, Ga., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide an increase in compensation of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Los Angeles, Calif., Postal Organizations

Council, signed by Carl H. Reister, secretary, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROPOSED SALARY INCREASE FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES—PETITION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have received an enormous amount of mail, and I am sure many other Senators have received the same, relating to the problems of postal workers.

The distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, who, I am happy to say, is present in the Chamber, has informed me that on Monday next the committee will open hearings on the question of compensation for postal workers.

Mr. President, I have intimate experience and personal experience with many of these people, and in altogether too many cases, considering the dignity of the United States, do they have to find outside work and perform double jobs in order to make a living.

An analysis has been made of the rate of indebtedness among postal workers, under ordinary living standards, and it has been found that the rate of indebtedness is very much higher for postal workers than it is among those who work in private business.

Mr. President, it is our national responsibility to maintain an effective and efficient postal service. We should appropriate whatever money is needed for that purpose, adjust postal rates to what we consider to be the public interest, and call upon the Post Office Department to render such services free or for less than cost as we again think is in the national interest. But none of that, Mr. President, should be taken out of the backs of the postal workers. They were entitled to compensation which is commensurate with the standard of service they render and with prevailing rates of wages and compensation and job security in private business.

Mr. President, it is my deep conviction the postal workers are not receiving those benefits now. I hope very much this matter will have the sympathetic attention of the committee. I know the chairman of the committee to be one of the great, understanding friends of postal employees and their problems, and I hope very much this matter will have the speedy attention of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition signed by several hundred postal workers of Syracuse, N. Y., and vicinity, bearing upon this subject.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION FOR PASSAGE OF H. R. 6 AND S. 27

We, the undersigned, feel that there is an overwhelming need for better personnel relations and a decent standard of living for postal employees and other Federal workers.

These conditions will be approached with the passage of H. R. 6 and S. 27. The former referring to personnel relations and the latter

providing an increase in wages for postal employees.

Therefore we urge that these bills be enacted into law.

(Signed by Robert W. Johnson and sundry other citizens of Syracuse, N. Y., and vicinity.)

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF TELEVISION STATION WRGB—RESOLUTION AND LETTERS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to make a few brief remarks about the proposed transfer of a television channel from the area around Schenectady, N. Y., by an order of the FCC, to Syracuse, N. Y. The people in this area have deep complaint, for considerably more than 100,000 will be deprived of television service through their existing receiving machines, if this transfer shall be effected.

My distinguished colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] spoke about this matter on May 2. I agree with what the Senator from Vermont said, and wish to record my view accordingly. He referred to the fact that there is now pending before the Federal Communications Commission a proposal relating to transferring a television channel from WRGB, Schenectady, to Syracuse, N. Y.

WRGB is a very high frequency television channel, and the suggestion is made to replace it by an ultra-high-frequency channel. I have received a large number of complaints from constituents against this prospect, and they seem to me to state a very sympathetic case. I have been in close touch with the Federal Communications Commission. The Commission has informed me that there is only one VHF station in the large area comprising the Albany, Schenectady, Troy area—channel 6 in Schenectady.

The Commission also stated to me as follows:

After reviewing the comments of all parties in the proceeding, the Commission concluded in its report and order that the public interest would be served by deleting channel 10 from Vail Mills, by shifting channel 6 from Schenectady to Syracuse and by substituting UHF channel 47 for channel 6 at Schenectady. Since the deletion of channel 6 from Schenectady would require a modification of the General Electric Co.'s license for operation of station WRGB on channel 6 at Schenectady, in accordance with section 316 of the Communications Act, the Commission, simultaneously with the issuance of its report and order, issued a show-cause order to the General Electric Co. notifying it of the action proposed and affording it an opportunity to file a response on or before April 15, 1957, indicating any objections that it might have to operate on channel 47 rather than channel 6 and whether a public hearing in the matter is desired.

That case is still pending. The Commission has informed me that the reason for the proposed change stems from the necessity for improving the opportunity for more effective competition among a greater number of stations and that, therefore, the area should be deintermixed by which the Commission means that there should be either all ultra or all very high frequency. Since there are already a number of ultra-high-frequency stations and it is anticipated that more will be authorized under the dein-

termixture proposal WRGB would be eliminated.

Of course, people who have television sets which are not modified to receive the UHF stations in the Albany-Schenectady area would be completely deprived of television unless they purchased additional electronic equipment costing from \$50 to \$100. Even so, it is estimated by a number of engineers, that assuming this expensive modification, approximately 120,000 people in the area will be completely deprived of television because the very high frequency carries better to the fringes of the television area than does ultra high frequency.

I ask unanimous consent that the texts of a number of representative letters from New Yorkers be printed in the Record to indicate the views which I have been receiving in my office. While there has been no final decision by the Federal Communications Commission, it certainly contemplates the elimination of this station; and I must say in all frankness that I agree with the feeling of the Senator from Vermont that the Federal Communications Commission should review this case with the greatest of care, and should refuse to make any determination which will be detrimental to so many viewers, without assuring that there is adequate prospect for TV coverage of the area.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Record a resolution adopted by the council of the city of Schenectady; a report of the resolution adopted by the town of Shandaken, N. Y.; a resolution of the Stamford Woman's Club, of Stamford, N. Y.; a resolution of the Stamford Methodist Church, of Stamford, N. Y.; a resolution of the Fort Plain Community Club, Fort Plain, N. Y.; and a very interesting letter commenting on this matter from the superintendent of schools of Schenectady and president of the Mohawk-Hudson Council on Educational Television.

There being no objection, the resolution and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 5815

Whereas station WRGB has been served with an order to show cause returnable on April 15, 1957, before the Federal Communications Commission, why television station WRGB should not transfer its operation from VHF channel 6 to UHF channel 47; and

Whereas such transfer would not be in the public interest as many television viewers would be forced to purchase new sets or equip their present television sets with costly converters; and

Whereas it is estimated that such a transfer of operations would deprive at least 120,000 television viewers in the capital area, parts of the Adirondacks, Vermont, and Massachusetts of any television service; and

Whereas station WRGB has been a pioneer in telecasting since 1939 and is serving pioneer viewers on channel 6: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in the interest of justice and the public welfare, the council of the city of Schenectady urges the Federal Communications Commission to reconsider its action; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded forthwith by the clerk of the city of Schenectady to the Federal Communications Commission, Representative BERNARD

W. KEARNEY, Senator IRVING M. IVES, and Senator JACOB K. JAVITS.

TOWN OF SHANDAKEN,

Shandaken, N. Y., March 9, 1957.

Senator JACOB JAVITS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: At the regular meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Shandaken, held March 9, 1957, it was unanimously moved by the board to ask you to use your influence in the matter of Schenectady Television Station WRGB, channel 6, that it be kept under the very high frequency rather than ultrahigh frequency.

Approximately 75 percent of the television owners in our town would be cut off from reception, as this is the only channel received by these people.

Thanking you,

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH FEITZINGER,
Town Clerk.

STAMFORD WOMAN'S CLUB,

Stamford, N. Y., March 25, 1957.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: The Federal Communications Commission is contemplating changing the Schenectady Television Station WRGB from very high frequency to ultrahigh frequency. We believe that this change will cause the majority of the residents in this area to be without television as ultrahigh frequency is not obtainable here.

The Stamford Woman's Club is asking for your aid in protesting this change. Your influence in the matter will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

ELLA M. LAMONT
Mrs. George D. Lamont,
Corresponding Secretary.

STAMFORD, N. Y., March 22, 1957.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I am writing at the request of the Women's Society of Christian Service of the Stamford Methodist Church, a group of about 50 women. They asked me to protest to the Federal Communications Commission in regard to the proposed change of Schenectady TV station WRGB from VHF to UHF, and to ask you to use your influence against this change.

WRGB is the only television station that gives good reception in this whole mountain area, and if the frequency is lowered, we will be able to get nothing on our sets. We will be most grateful for all that you can do.

Cordially,

DAISEY R. DESILVA,
MRS. LEO H. DESILVA,
Vice President, WSCS.

FORT PLAIN COMMUNITY CLUB,

Fort Plain, N. Y., April 8, 1957.

The Honorable JACOB J. JAVITS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A resolution was adopted by this service club opposing the change in channel from No. 6 (VHF), Schenectady, N. Y., to Syracuse, N. Y., while establishing channel No. 47 (UHF) for the Schenectady area, for the following reasons:

A very small percentage of the sets owned by area families are capable of receiving UHF. Therefore, a financial burden would be imposed upon them to replace their sets or purchase converters and new antennas.

WRGB on channel No. 6 is the only station that gives our area residents satisfactory reception, and from the reports UHF, No. 47, would not be able to reach into many sections now covered by VHF No. 6.

This organization and the community it serves will greatly appreciate your expressing our opposition to the Federal Communication Commission and assisting us in opposing this change.

Very truly yours,

LELAND SMITH, *President.*

SCHENECTADY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Schenectady, N. Y., March 18, 1957.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JAVITS: I respectfully call to your attention the proposed change of station WRGB in Schenectady from VHF to UHF channel. I represent several interests in writing this communication. As a citizen of Schenectady, I have a deep interest in the service provided by WRGB. However, my position as superintendent of schools in Schenectady and as president of Mohawk-Hudson Council on Educational Television is the one from which my comments will be directed.

For the last 4 years, WRGB has been giving an hour a day, 5 days a week, of its prime morning time to the Mohawk-Hudson Council. Not only the time but the services of the staff at the station and considerable financial support have been offered by the station. With their support, Mohawk-Hudson Council has provided an educational television service to an extremely receptive television audience within the viewing range of WRGB's VHF broadcast. This past year, the station in Plattsburgh has further extended the activity of the council's program through simultaneous broadcast picked up from WRGB.

This operation involves hundreds of schools, colleges, museums, historical societies, and other cultural organizations of the community. They are paying members of the Mohawk-Hudson Council on Educational Television. In the case of the schools, they have put much effort into not only programming but into the proper reception and use of program offerings of significance to the curriculums of the schools.

The very existence of the council is threatened by this proposed change. Our schools are almost 100 percent equipped for very high frequency reception. Many of them are outside the range of ultrahigh frequency. Their continued membership in our council is dependent on assurances of next year's programming over WRGB. This very outstanding example of educational television supported at the community level merits a better fate than dissolution through precipitous action.

May I urge your most serious consideration of all aspects of this decision to change WRGB from VHF to UHF. We in the schools of this area, public, parochial, and private, strongly urge the retention of very high frequency for WRGB.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. MURRAY.

RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from the city clerk of the city of St. Paul, Minn., transmitting a resolution adopted by the city council, protesting against the enactment of House bill 6790, to eliminate Federal control of the production and sale of natural gas. I present the resolution, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the council is informed that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives has begun hearings on a bill introduced in Congress on April 10, 1957, by Congressman HARRIS, said bill being designated as H. R. 6790, and which bill, among other things, proposes to change the basis for determination of the production cost of gas paid or charged by interstate pipeline companies through the elimination of the present method of determining cost by the use of the public utility rate base cost of service formula and procedure and substituting in lieu thereof the reasonable market price, to be determined by the Federal Power Commission; and

Whereas the Council of the City of St. Paul is of the opinion that the bill provides no clear and adequate standards for determining the reasonable market price for gas and which, if the bill become law, could result in a determination of a price for gas in excess of that necessary for the adequate compensation to the producers of natural gas, contrary to the best interests of the ultimate consumers of gas; and

Whereas the council is informed and believes that a majority of the natural gas reserves are owned and controlled by a few large corporations, and there is no true competitive market in the sale, transportation, and resale of natural gas in interstate commerce; and

Whereas the price of natural gas to the ultimate consumer in St. Paul is a matter of vital concern for all the citizens in this city, made especially more so by reason of the cold weather which this city has in the winter season, and further by reason of the large number of ultimate consumers which are now using natural gas for domestic purposes in this city; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the city council that if this new Harris bill should become law, it could very well result in substantial increases in the cost of gas allowed to the pipeline carriers serving this city and to the ultimate consumers in this city; and

Whereas the council is firmly convinced that by reason of the facts recited above, this legislation is contrary to the public interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of St. Paul hereby opposes the passage of the new Harris bill or any other legislation of a similar nature, or any legislation which seeks to eliminate or restrict in any manner the present, legally recognized control by the Federal Government through the Federal Power Commission of the production and sale of natural gas in the field; and be it further

Resolved, That the council requests the Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota to do their utmost to defeat this bill and any legislation of a similar type which might be introduced in Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the mayor of the city of St. Paul is hereby directed to file a written statement of the opposition of this council to the bill and is hereby directed to present this resolution to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on May 13, 1957, and to join with the other mayors of the large gas-consuming cities to present an argument in protest against the so-called Harris bill; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk is directed to send forthwith a copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Member of the United States Congress from the State of Minnesota, and to each member of the Inter-

state and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the council May 10, 1957.

Approved May 10, 1957.

JOSEPH E. DILLON,
Mayor.

RESOLUTION OF CONNECTICUT PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Connecticut, relating to Federal safety requirements for natural-gas pipelines.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, STATE OF CONNECTICUT, CONCERNING H. R. 2809, FEDERAL SAFETY REQUIREMENTS FOR NATURAL-GAS PIPELINES

It appearing, that H. R. 2809 introduced in the House of Representatives of the 85th Congress 1st session, which has been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, proposes the amendment of the Natural Gas Act for the purpose of authorizing the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety requirements for natural-gas companies; and

It appearing further, that the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Connecticut is authorized by the provisions of chapter 264a of the 1955 supplement to the general statutes of Connecticut to promulgate safety and regulations providing for increased safety in the transportation and distribution of natural gas within this State; and

It appearing further, that the Public Utilities Commission has adopted rules and regulations for the aforesaid purpose (Commission Docket No. 8612).

Now, therefore, we the undersigned, comprising the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Connecticut, petition and memorialize the Connecticut Representatives and Senators in Congress that the enactment of H. R. 2809 should be opposed for the reason that the State of Connecticut has adequate and satisfactory safety requirements in effect, and the enactment of said H. R. 2809 would constitute an unnecessary and unreasonable interference with the right and powers of the State of Connecticut to exercise supervision and regulation over natural-gas pipelines within this State.

We hereby direct that a copy of this petition be forwarded by the secretary of this commission to each Connecticut Representative and Senator in Congress.

Dated at Hartford, Conn., this 1st day of May 1957.

EUGENE J. LAUGHLIN,
HENRY B. STRONG,
BASIL P. FITZPATRICK,
*Public Utilities Commission,
State of Connecticut.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H. R. 4136. An act to extend the period within which Export-Import Bank of Washington may make loans (Rept. No. 331).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H. R. 53. An act to consolidate into one act, and to simplify and make more uniform,

the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration relating to compensation, pension, hospitalization, and burial benefits, and to consolidate into one act the laws pertaining to the administration of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration (Rept. No. 332).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN (by request):

S. 2097. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926; and

S. 2098. A bill to amend the act providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization to provide for uniform per diem allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. GREEN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 2099. A bill for the relief of Irene B. Moss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2100. A bill for the relief of Claire G. Trigledas; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 2101. A bill for the relief of Mr. Yervant Boulgarian and his wife, Mrs. Haiganouche Boulgarian; and

S. 2102. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Plastino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2103. A bill for the relief of Ernest E. Glasford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 2104. A bill for the relief of Rosina Jonasch;

S. 2105. A bill for the relief of Anna Palinkas; and

S. 2106. A bill for the relief of Gregory J. Kessenich and others (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2107. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Florida of a certain tract of land in such State owned by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2108. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to name, rename, or otherwise designate any building under the custody and control of the General Services Administration; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (by request):

S. 2109. A bill to amend an act extending the authorized taking area for public building construction under the Public Buildings Act of 1926, as amended, to exclude therefrom the area within E and F Streets and 19th Street and Virginia Avenue, Northwest, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2110. A bill for the relief of Shirley Leeke Kilpatrick;

S. 2111. A bill for the relief of Yuko Shiba; and

S. 2112. A bill for the relief of Joaquin Gil Carrasco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 2113. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, with respect to allowances in the cost of service and accelerated amortization and liberalized depreciation for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

NATIONAL COWBOY HALL OF FAME AND MUSEUM

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators BARRETT, BENNETT, BIBLE, CARLSON, CARROLL, CASE of South Dakota, CHURCH, CURTIS, DWORSHAK, GOLDWATER, HAYDEN, HENNINGS, HRUSKA, JACKSON, KERR, KUCHEL, LANGER, MAGNUSON, MALONE, MANSFIELD, MONRONEY, MORSE, MUNDT, MURRAY, NEUBERGER, WATKINS, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution which has as its purpose the recognition of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum to be located in Oklahoma City, Okla.

For a number of years stockmen, ranchers, cowboys, and other citizens interested in the history of the development of our great West have given of their time and effort to bring into being an organization that would have national recognition, and whose purpose it would be to preserve something of the story of the development of the cattle industry in this country.

It was Mr. C. A. Reynolds, of Kansas City, Mo., who conceived the idea of the Cowboy Hall of Fame to be dedicated to all cowmen who had a prominent part in the development of the American West.

It was in 1953 and 1954, after he spent his personal funds touring the 17 Western States, talking with governors, prominent livestock men and women, that Mr. Reynolds' idea began to take permanent form leading to organization of the board of trustees for the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum.

Early in 1955 the trustees met in Denver, Colo., and chose a five-man committee to make recommendations for a permanent site for the structure in which men who contributed greatly to the development of the West were to be honored, and where representative evidence of the life and culture of their times was to be preserved.

The site selection committee carefully studied 400 applications from Western States and brought the list down to 10, then to 3. Representatives from those three communities were requested to attend a meeting of the entire board of trustees at Denver, and make their presentations, where, on April 15, 1955, by majority vote, the trustees selected Oklahoma City. On November 11, 1955, the trustees met in Oklahoma City and dedicated the 37-acre, \$150,000 site provided alongside 2 major transcontinental highways.

Subsequently, citizens of Oklahoma City raised, by popular subscription, the sum of \$750,000, while other Oklahomans added an additional \$250,000 to make the first million dollars for construction of the initial expansion-type building to house the hall of fame and museum. Citizens of the other Western States are now engaged in providing more funds in what is planned eventually to be a \$5 million structure.

For their contributions to the West, five men have already been voted into the hall of fame; others will follow. The first men are Will Rogers, of Oklahoma; Charles Russell, of Montana; Charles Goodnight, of Texas; Jake McClure, of New Mexico; and Theodore Roosevelt, of New York and the Dakotas.

The National Cowboy Hall of Fame will be constructed and maintained without cost to any governmental agency, which is fitting under the best traditions of the men and the era which it will perpetuate as a part of our great American heritage.

Because of the national interest in the preservation of historical and present-day records of men who have contributed much to the West, and the preservation of personal effects, mementos, relics, equipment and other accoutrements, I believe the National Cowboy Hall of Fame is deserving of congressional recognition. Therefore, I am glad to join in sponsoring this concurrent resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the board of trustees of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum, together with the list of its signers, and the text of the concurrent resolution which I have today submitted, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution adopted by the board of trustees, National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, together with the signatures attached, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE NATIONAL COWBOY HALL OF FAME AND MUSEUM, JANUARY 5, 1957, AT PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Whereas the Board of Trustees of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum, a nonprofit foundation, having previously completed their organization with two members from each of the 17 Western States, with Governors of those States sitting ex-officio, did after careful investigation on April 15, 1955, select Oklahoma City, Okla., as the site of the permanent structure of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum; and

Whereas the board of trustees did on November 11, 1955, dedicate at Oklahoma City the 37-acre site, provided by the people of the city of Oklahoma City and the State of Oklahoma; and

Whereas the people of Oklahoma through private subscription raised the equivalent of \$1 million as their initial goal toward construction of the first unit of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum; and

Whereas citizens of the other 16 Western States now are undertaking by private subscription to raise an additional \$4 million to complete a fitting shrine to men outstanding in opening and developing the West, with a museum for archives, artifacts, and other evidence of an era that so enriched our American historical heritage; and

Whereas the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum will be a valuable contribution to the folklore of America, of material benefit to all citizens and scholars of the present and future: Therefore be it

Resolved by the board of trustees, That the Congress of the United States be requested by resolution or other parliamentary means to memorialize and/or commend to the people of the United States, the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum as a national shrine, and that a copy of such engrossed resolution be made a part of permanent

archives of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum.

The board of trustees: C. A. Reynolds, of Missouri, chairman; Albert K. Mitchell, of New Mexico, 1st vice chairman; Fred H. Dressler, of Nevada, 2d vice chairman; A. W. Swenson, of Texas, 3d vice chairman; Nelson P. Crow, of California; Chester Paxton, of Nebraska; Alan Rogers, of Washington; Fred Porter, Jr., of Arizona; R. J. Hofmann, of Wyoming; Ray Schnell, of North Dakota; Burt L. Hall, of South Dakota; F. S. Spencer, of Montana; Rex Bell, of Nevada; A. D. Brownfield, of New Mexico; Lowe P. Howell, of Arizona; Brooks Keogh, of North Dakota; William F. Fencer, of Washington; Hal Cooper, of Oklahoma; Lee Sneed, of Oklahoma; E. H. Shoemaker, Jr., of Nebraska; Victor E. Anderson, of Nebraska, Governor; F. D. Ackerman, of Colorado; E. L. Mechem, of New Mexico, Governor; John D. Lewis, of Utah; J. Hugo Aronson, of Montana, Governor; Fred W. Heine, of Kansas; F. L. Blomquist, of Idaho; Millward L. Simpson, of Wyoming, Governor; John E. Davis, of North Dakota, Governor; Ernest B. Ham, of South Dakota; Joe Foss, of South Dakota, Governor; K. Ross Toole, of Montana; Irwin Mann, of Oregon; Robert D. Holmes, of Oregon, Governor; Harold J. Powers, of California; Charles H. Russell, of Nevada, Governor; Clyde Storr, of Idaho; Raymond Gary, of Oklahoma, Governor; Ernest W. McFarland, of Arizona, Governor; Roy J. Turner, of Oklahoma; George Docking, of Kansas, Governor; Albert D. Rosellini, of Washington, Governor; L. H. Strong, of Utah; Goodwin J. Knight, of California, Governor; Steve McNichols, of Colorado, Governor; Daniel I. J. Thornton, of Colorado; J. W. Jonester, Jr., of Oregon; George D. Clyde, of Utah, Governor.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32), submitted by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas citizens of 17 Western States where the cattle trade contributed a colorful chapter to the whole history of the United States and particularly to that of the grasslands on which the cattle trade flourished, have cooperated in the establishment at Oklahoma City, Okla., of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum; and

Whereas it is the purpose of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum to honor past and present cowboys, stockmen, and ranchers who have contributed to the initial development of the West; and

Whereas in order to perpetuate the contributions by acts and deeds of these men and women, the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum proposes to erect such buildings or monuments as may be deemed appropriate to be a lasting memorial to those pioneers; and

Whereas the preservation of historical and present day documents, mementos, personal effects and relics of these pioneers is of national interest and will be a valuable contribution to the folklore of America: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Congress hereby recognizes the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum as a memorial to individuals who have made outstanding contributions in the opening and development of the West and as a fitting and valuable insti-

tution for the collection and preservation of artifacts and other evidences and data relating to the role the West has played in enriching our American historical heritage.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There will be no sense in building a Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum in Oklahoma, New Mexico, or anywhere else, unless we can meet the situation in which the economic independence of the United States is being undermined by the expansion of national commerce by foreign corporations holding charters issued by foreign governments and by States which have no control over commerce.

Mr. ANDERSON. When I first came to the Congress, in 1941, one of the first tasks I assigned myself was the collection of the reports of the Temporary National Economic Committee, headed by the able Senator from Wyoming. As the years pass, those reports ripen and become more valuable to the people of the country. The studies which the Senator made then and the studies he is now making, are very worthwhile contributions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be held at the desk until the close of business on Monday, May 20, 1957, for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT OF 1926

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926. The bill authorizes the appropriation of \$100 million to finance a 10-year building program for the acquisition of office and housing space by the Department of State overseas; \$50 million of this sum will be in the form of foreign currency credits.

This proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with the letter from the Secretary of State to the Vice President in regard to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2097) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, introduced by Mr. GREEN (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Re-

lations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U. S. C., sec. 295), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to amounts previously authorized, an amount not to exceed \$100 million, of which \$50 million shall be available exclusively for payments representing the value, in whole or in part, of property or credits in accordance with the provisions of the act of July 25, 1946 (60 Stat. 663). Sums appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall remain available until expendable."

The letter presented by Mr. GREEN is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 9, 1957.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Department submits and recommends for your consideration the enclosed proposed legislation amending the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926 (22 U. S. C. 292-300).

Authorizations of appropriations to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Service Buildings Act from 1926 to the present total \$231,625,000, of which \$200 million is authorized to be used exclusively for payments to agencies of the United States Government for foreign credits and currencies. With the appropriation for fiscal year 1957, there remains an unappropriated balance of authorization of \$64,595,000 of which \$57,234,000 is for the procurement of foreign currencies and \$7,361,000 is in dollar authorization. These amounts will be reduced further by the appropriation for fiscal year 1958.

The Department of State has thus far acquired residences, office buildings, and staff housing for the use of diplomatic and consular personnel overseas valued at approximately \$148 million. Even so, many of the personnel at overseas posts are working and living in accommodations far below the standards considered minimum in the United States of America. In order to assess the total needs overseas, the Department in July 1955 initiated a post-by-post survey of buildings requirements. As a result of this survey, a program was prepared contemplating an expenditure of approximately \$200 million through fiscal year 1965 to meet these basic requirements. A copy of the program is enclosed.

The needs of the United States Information Agency are included with those of the Department of State without specific identification in the attached building program. Any future needs of the Agency for office space or special-purpose facilities space will be included in the plans for the specific building programs for the embassies and consulates concerned. For housing purposes, Public Affairs Officers of the United States Information Service overseas will be regarded as senior officers of the embassies and consulates, and other American staff of the United States Information Service will be regarded as embassy or consular staff.

Acquisitions under the Foreign Service Buildings Act have been financed largely through the use of foreign currency credits. Surplus property and lend-lease credits have provided foreign currencies for a substantial portion of the program. The use of these credits permitted the conversion of a portion of the debts to tangible assets of lasting value. The disposal of surplus agriculture commodities authorized under Public Law 480 is providing foreign currency credits which also are useful in financing the buildings program.

There are, however, certain limitations to the use of foreign currency credits. Substantial sums of these credits are located in countries where the need for building facilities is no longer acute. Under regulations prescribed by the United States Department of the Treasury and placed in effect on December 1, 1953, all agencies of the United States Government needing foreign exchange are required to purchase it from the United States Treasury holdings and they may not purchase from external sources unless the Treasury cannot supply the kind of currency needed. Only a relatively small number of foreign currencies are held by the Treasury in substantial amounts, relative to overall United States needs, and this number is being reduced by exchange conversion of surplus holdings into currencies in demand.

The buildings program funds the maintenance and operating costs for owned and long-term-leased buildings of the Department of State overseas. A number of these buildings are located in areas where no currency credits are available and United States dollars must be expended to meet the obligations under these circumstances. Consequently, the dollar requirements have increased over recent years and probably they will increase further in the future.

The proposed amendment to section 4 will authorize additional appropriations of \$100 million of which \$50 million is to be in foreign currency credit authorization. A statement reflecting the authorizations and appropriations under the Foreign Service Buildings Act is enclosed.

The Department of State has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation to the Congress of the proposed legislation.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

(Enclosure: 1. Copy of draft bill. 2. Copy of Foreign Buildings Requirements 1957-65 inclusive. 3. Copy of Department of State Authorizations and Appropriations for the Foreign Buildings Program.)

UNIFORM PER DIEM ALLOWANCES FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act providing for membership and participation of the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to provide for uniform per diem allowances, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation has been requested by the Acting Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which the public and Members of the Senate may direct their attention and comments. I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with the letter from the Acting Secretary of State to the Vice President in regard to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2098) to amend the act providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization to provide for uniform per diem allowances, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GREEN (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to amend the act providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization to provide for uniform per diem allowances, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 30, 1946, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (22 U. S. C. 287m-287t) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking the proviso contained in section 2 (22 U. S. C. 287o) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"Provided however, that he may be allowed transportation expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence, while away from his home or regular place of business in attendance upon authorized meetings or in consultation on request with the Department of State, in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b-2), as amended."

(2) By striking the last sentence in section 5 (22 U. S. C. 287q) and substituting in lieu thereof:

"Under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, the travel expenses of experts attending such conferences shall be borne by the Department of State and they may be allowed transportation expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence for the period of actual attendance and of necessary travel, in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b-2), as amended."

The letter presented by Mr. GREEN is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 7, 1957.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith a draft of a proposed amendment to Public Law 565 (79th Cong., 2d sess.), providing for uniform per diem allowances for members of the United States National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

At the present time, the members receive a per diem of \$10 as prescribed by the act. The purpose of the amendment is to provide for uniform allowances in accordance with current prevailing rates prescribed by Congress for advisory groups serving without compensation. A roster of members of the Commission is enclosed.

(Roster omitted.)

It is recommended that the Congress take favorable action on the enclosed draft bill.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the transmission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

A similar communication is being forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Acting Secretary.

(Enclosures: 1. Two copies of amendment to Public Law 565. 2. Membership list of United States National Commission for UNESCO.)

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL POWER ACT, RELATING TO CERTAIN ALLOWANCES FOR INCOME TAX PURPOSES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, with respect to allowances in the cost of service and accelerated amortization and liberalized depreciation for income-tax purposes. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2113) to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, with respect to allowances in the cost of service and accelerated amortization and liberalized depreciation for income-tax purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT—RAPID AMORTIZATION BILL

A bill to amend the Federal Power Act with respect to allowances in the cost of service and accelerated amortization and liberalized depreciation for income-tax purposes.

I. THE PROBLEM

Electric power companies have been collecting large sums of money from their customers by working a maneuver involving the use of different methods of depreciation for rate purposes from the methods used for tax purposes so as to pocket for themselves a major portion of the tax money collected from their customers. This is the way it works:

(a) For rate purposes, a company normally depreciates its plant according to straight-line depreciation methods over the average service life expectancy of the plant. Thus, for example, a dam with a 50-year average service life expectancy would be depreciated 2 percent each year.

(b) But the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 permits such a company, under section 167, to depreciate its plant for tax purposes under two alternative methods which permit it to take more rapid depreciation early in the plant's life, and then less depreciation later. This is known as accelerated depreciation, or liberalized depreciation by accountants. Section 168 of the code permits even more rapid amortization upon receipt of a certificate of defense necessity from the Office of Defense Mobilization.

(c) When a company submits its costs of service for approval for ratemaking purposes by the Commission, it lists only straight-line depreciation costs. It then claims money to pay income taxes, basing its claim on the assumption that the company will show earnings at a level consistent with such low depreciation costs.

1. For example: suppose a dam built since 1954 with a 50-year average service life expectancy costs \$100 million. The straight-line depreciation of that dam would be 2 per-

cent per year, of \$2 million. The company would be allowed to earn 6 percent return on its \$100 million investment, or \$6 million. If its costs of operation, property taxes, and other expenses of doing business were \$15 million for the year, a simplified version of its cost-of-service asking would look like this:

Cost of operation, maintenance, property taxes, etc.....	\$15,000,000
Depreciation.....	2,000,000
Return before income taxes.....	12,500,000
Income taxes (52 percent of return).....	6,500,000
Net return.....	6,000,000
Total cost of service (allowable operating revenues).....	29,500,000

(d) But when the company submits its income-tax return, it takes advantage of liberalized depreciation provisions.

1. For example: it may be able to claim twice as much depreciation as it projected for rate purposes under the provisions of section 167 alone. Using the above example, let us say that the company finds that \$4,000,000 can be claimed as depreciation for tax purposes. If the company has in fact taken in the \$29,500,000 allowed it for operating revenues, its tax return shows the following:

Cost of operation, maintenance, property taxes, etc.....	\$15,000,000
Depreciation.....	4,000,000
Return before income taxes.....	10,500,000
Income taxes (52% of return).....	5,450,000
Net return.....	5,050,000
Total cost of service.....	29,500,000

This makes the net return look like only \$5,050,000, but it actually is \$7,050,000 for there is an additional \$2,000,000 caused by the use of liberalized depreciation. Of that \$2,000,000, \$950,000 of it is legitimate earnings allowed the company by the Commission, but \$1,050,000 of it is tax savings or deferred taxes because of the use of liberalized depreciation. Thus the company has collected from the rate payers \$1,050,000 for taxes which in fact it has not paid out as taxes.

(e) This tax saving has been described by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation as an interest-free loan to the company.

1. Some companies are treating the tax saving as a reserve for deferred taxes on the theory that if taxes remain the same and their earnings remain the same—some time, perhaps 25 years from now—the depreciation allowance for tax purposes will have declined to less than the depreciation allowance for rate purposes and the reserve will be needed to prevent a rate increase. In the meantime, the money saved is available for investment.

2. Other companies have openly treated the tax saving as extra earnings. Some have openly distributed it to their stockholders—at least one even claiming that it is returned capital and not subject to income tax. This despite the fact that the money had been collected for taxes from the customers.

(f) The tax saving is not a loan, however. The money may never be paid as taxes. So long as a company has an expanding business—so long as it is investing in new plant and equipment—it can offset any decline in depreciation allowance of old plant and equipment by the high depreciation allowance on its new plant and equipment. Indeed, if its new plant and equipment investments are larger than old plant and equipment retirements, the company can go on indefinitely pocketing ever increasing tax savings. Worse yet, it can accomplish this, in

part, by investing the tax savings themselves. Even if plant replacements only equal plant retirements, it will never pay 1 cent of such deferred taxes to the Treasury. Only if the business declines and contracts its plant and equipment might it ever encounter a situation where depreciation allowances for rate purposes might exceed depreciation allowed for taxes.

II. EXPLANATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

(a) Objectives:

1. To prohibit licensees and public utilities from collecting money for income taxes which they are not going to pay out as income taxes.

2. To force licensees and public utilities which have already collected money for income taxes which they have not paid out for income taxes to subtract such money from their net investment.

(b) Effect of the provisions:

1. The prohibition on collecting tax money not paid out will lower the tax allowance in the cost of service, thus lowering rates to the consumer.

2. The requirement that accumulated tax savings be deducted from the net investment will lower the investment base upon which the rate of return is calculated. This will also lower rates to the consumer, but far less than the prohibition on tax allowance. Actually, the rate payer will only be spared from paying interest on the money he has already improperly been forced to give the company.

(c) Provisions in the bill amending the Federal Power Act:

1. Sections 205 and 206 of the Federal Power Act, which deal with rates permitted all electric utility companies, are amended to prohibit any company from collecting money from customers to pay income taxes which the company does not actually pay. The amendment also provides that any such tax savings which have already been collected shall be subtracted from the company's net investment. This appears as section 5 of the bill.

2. Section 20 of the Federal Power Act, which deals with rates permitted hydroelectric licensees, is amended in the same language as sections 205 and 206 to prohibit any company from collecting money from customers to pay income taxes which the company does not actually pay. By amending section 14 (see below), section 20 is also amended in the same language as sections 205 and 206 to provide that any such tax savings which have already been collected shall be subtracted from the company's net investment. The amendment to section 20 appears as section 4 of the bill.

3. Section 3 of the Federal Power Act, which defines terms used in the act, is amended to define tax savings—the money already collected for taxes not paid—as the difference between the taxes which the company would have paid using the depreciation allowance it claimed for cost of service purposes and the taxes it paid using the liberalized depreciation allowances permitted under the Internal Revenue Code. This appears as section 1 of the bill.

4. Section 10d of the Federal Power Act, which provides for a special amortization reserve to be created from surplus earnings after 20 years of operation of a licensed hydroelectric project, is amended to require that in calculating proper costs of service allowed the licensee the Commission shall allow as proper tax costs only the taxes actually paid. This simply makes the amortization reserve section consistent with the changes in section 20. This appears as section 2 of the bill.

5. Section 14 of the Federal Power Act, which deals with the right of the United States to take over a licensed project and establishes the method of determining the net investment remaining in such project which the Government would owe the li-

censee, is amended to require that any tax savings accumulated by the licensee shall be subtracted from the net investment. This simply makes the takeover section consistent with the changes in section 20. It also makes section 20 consistent with the amendments to section 205 and 206, for section 20 provides that the method prescribed for determining net investment in section 14 shall be used for ratemaking. This appears as section 3 of the bill.

INCREASED MONTHLY RATES OF PENSION PAYABLE TO CERTAIN WIDOWS AND FORMER WIDOWS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. COTTON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 358) to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to widows and former widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT:

Editorial entitled "Thirty Years of Service," published in the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Journal of May 12, 1957, relating to the service of Rev. Rew Walz, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Rapid City.

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "William L. McKnight, Realist—Fifty Years as Part of MMM," written by Carl Hennemann, and published in the St. Paul (Minn.) Sunday Pioneer Press of May 12, 1957.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Editorial entitled "An Appeal to Reason," published in the Washington Sunday Star of May 12, 1957, relating to the agricultural problem.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Editorial entitled "Is It Worth Keeping?" published in the Billings (Mont.) Gazette of Sunday, May 12, 1957.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Editorial entitled "Post Office Men Need Their Raise," from the Coos Bay (Oreg.) Times of May 2, 1957.

By Mr. CHURCH:

Excerpts from letters from the colleagues, former students, and acquaintances of Prof. Tom Barclay, of Stanford University's department of political science, upon his forthcoming retirement.

By Mr. BUSH:

Editorial in tribute to Judge Samuel Melitz.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Editorial entitled "A Record Tax Payment," published in the Washington (Pa.) Reporter of May 14, 1957.

Article concerning importance of skill in the use of weapons, published in the Army and Navy Journal of May 11, 1957.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF MAURICE AUGUSTUS CREWS TO BE AN ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been

scheduled for Monday, May 20, 1957, at 4 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Maurice Augustus Crews, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Commissioner of Patents, vice Arthur W. Crocker, elevated.

Prior to the above-mentioned date all persons interested in the above nomination should file with the committee such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself, chairman.

NORWAY'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, tomorrow the freedom-loving nations of the world will give recognition to the Independence Day of one of our sister nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—the sturdy Scandinavian kingdom of Norway. This day is known by the people of Norway and Americans of Norwegian descent as the “Syttende Mai,” in commemoration of the signing of the Constitution of Norway.

On the 17th of May in 1814, 143 years ago tomorrow, a determined group of Norwegian patriots met at Eidsvoll, outside of Oslo, Norway, to promulgate a constitution, which has continued to preserve the democratic principles of that brave nation. With the foresight and understanding which characterized the actions of our American forefathers, the writers of the Norwegian Constitution produced a supreme law of the land which has endured through almost a century and a half of struggles with crises caused by economic difficulties, wars, and enemy occupation. Embodied in this historic document are the principles of human and civil rights, sovereignty of the people, and the supremacy of the rule of law.

The simplicity and durability of the Norwegian Constitution reflects the character of this brave and noble nation. For centuries the people of Norway have struggled for their livelihood against the odds of rugged, mountainous geography and stormy seas. Such an environment has produced a strength of character which has time and again proved to be a valuable contribution to the cause of freedom and security in the world. I am proud to pay tribute today to the country of Norway, to its people, and to the contributions they have made to the preservation of the dignity of all mankind.

In the early days of World War II Norway for a time stood practically alone against the invading force of a totalitarian dictator. After a valiant stand the brave but small Norwegian forces finally were overcome by the overwhelming and cowardly attack. Norway was to be occupied for the remainder of the war, but the love of freedom and independence stayed on in the hearts of her people. After the defeat of Hitler this brave nation again took its rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Against the threat of Soviet communism the nation of the midnight sun has again taken a steadfast position in defiance of intimidation and threats of military aggression. Recently, in a let-

ter to Norway's Premier Einar Gerhardsen, Soviet Premier Bulganin threatened to annihilate any country which permitted stationing of American nuclear weapons within its boundaries. Norway's Premier replied by stating that, as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Norway would continue to cooperate with the United States and its other allies in doing whatever is deemed best for its own security. Premier Gerhardsen's reply to Bulganin proved to be an exemplary answer to the massive Soviet campaign of intimidation against the smaller nations belonging to NATO.

Mr. President, the nations of the Western World can have no doubt concerning the position of their Norwegian ally.

Today I point with special pride to my Norwegian ancestry. In humble respect for the memory of my Norwegian parents, and in proud tribute to the country from which they came, I reverently salute the people of Norway, who will tomorrow celebrate their independence day, “The Syttende Mai.”

INVESTIGATION OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS IN PORTLAND, OREG., BY SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a veteran reporter for the New York Times, Lawrence E. Davies, who has covered events on the Pacific coast for that eminent newspaper for many years, recently reported on the reactions in the two metropolitan cities of the Pacific Northwest to current investigations of the activities of top teamster officials, particularly teamster president Dave Beck. His reports from Portland and from Seattle appeared in the Times on May 5 and 6, respectively.

Mr. President, my own hometown of Portland had the doubtful distinction of nationwide publicity as a result of having been chosen as the initial target of investigation by the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in Labor or Management Field. In Portland, improper connections were probed between operations of the teamsters union and gambling and other forms of vice. The pursuit of these disclosures led far from questions of labor-management relations, into matters of gambling and law-enforcement in Portland which had first made headlines in Oregon early in 1956, and they made headlines again.

Due to the courtesy of the chairman of the select committee, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], I was privileged to appear before the committee on March 15, 1957, to testify, from my own knowledge and experience, to the true character of Portland as a city of ethical and law-abiding men and women, where such crime and vice as exists is of very petty proportions in relation to the size of the metropolitan area and population. I am indebted to the committee for the interest and patience with which they received my testimony in defense of the chief city in my State.

Thus, Mr. President, I was pleased to read the report of Mr. Davies in the New York Times under the headlines “Pride Returning to Portland, Oreg.,” and “—Boasts It Is One of Cleanest Coast Towns.” Mr. Davies wrote that “Portlanders are saying once more that the city of roses, homes, and churches is the cleanest place on the coast.” The State's own legal processes are continuing with the job of unraveling the facts and charges which temporarily placed Portland in the national spotlight. The beacon of that spotlight itself has moved on to the person of Mr. Beck, the president of the teamsters, and problems which are more directly in the field of possible improper activities in the field of labor-management relations.

This is the subject of Mr. Davies' report from Seattle in the New York Times of May 6. Seattle happens to be Mr. Beck's hometown and longtime base of operations. The complete success of his operations, and that of his union, in Seattle antedates by many years, even decades, the marginal activities in Portland which were recently made the subject of investigation by the select committee. Mr. Beck's effectiveness in the field of labor-management relations in Seattle, in the broad sense of that phrase, has long been such as to make him a leader among conservative businessmen of that city. As Mr. Davies writes:

For the pink-cheeked, 62-year-old Mr. Beck had become a big man in Seattle, one who was respected and feared. He was looked on not only as a benevolent despot in labor but as a business leader and a vigorous champion of capitalism and of free enterprise. Many of the city's leaders applauded in December 1952, when Emil Sick, a local brewer and baseball club owner, as toastmaster at a testimonial dinner, praised Mr. Beck as the greatest labor leader in the country.

Mr. Beck even became a regent of the University of Washington, helping to preside over the academic community of that important center of learning and education of future leaders of the Pacific Northwest. But now, to quote Mr. Davies again:

Business and civic leaders who toasted the onetime laundry wagon driver as one of Seattle's outstanding citizens on his election to the teamsters top post less than 5 years ago are surprised or embarrassed or, in some cases, uneasy over developments of recent weeks.

Mr. President, it has been no secret on the west coast how Mr. Beck achieved his rise to power as a labor leader and his unique eminence in Seattle. The history of these developments, as a matter of fact, falls a lot more squarely within the scope of improper activities in the labor or management field than does the petty vice in Portland which has been so predominantly featured in the recent investigation.

Prior to my entrance into public life, I was active for a number of years as a journalist and writer in the region where I was born and raised. As early as 1938, some of my newspaper and magazine assignments involved writing about such practices as the price-fixing arrangements between the teamsters union and certain business and industrial estab-

lishments in the Seattle area. If I am not mistaken, these agreements have had a far more adverse impact upon the consuming public than anything which has occurred in the vicinity of Portland. For example, the phrase "Dave Beck's voluntary NRA" was a common one in Seattle for many years, and it involved highly irregular pacts which raised such things as cleaning prices to exorbitant levels.

That is only one example which I happen to recall. It is unquestionably representative of the general rule, rather than an exception, in the iron grip which Mr. Beck fastened upon his home town through his ruthless control over vehicular transportation. Other examples have already been brought to the attention of the select committee. To a lesser degree, they are surely duplicated in many other cities outside of Seattle.

Mr. President, I am pleased to see Mr. Lawrence Davies report to the New York Times that Portland is recovering its pride and self-confidence after its dismay at having some of its local law-enforcement problems, which are only accidentally within the periphery of the Senate labor-management investigation, serve as the leadoff national attraction in that investigation. And the people of Portland will be glad to see the investigation turn to the more central problems of the corruption of collective bargaining and other economic processes by improper activities of labor or management officials, by which many cities far more than Portland have been brought within the grip of unscrupulous men.

I am voicing these brief remarks on the Senate floor today for one basic purpose. My home city has been severely hurt in national reputation and esteem by the damaging publicity it has suffered as a result of the recent Senate investigation. It is now my hope that the committee will give some fair perspective to this situation by undertaking similarly thorough investigations with respect to other cities where the teamsters union has been infinitely more powerful, aggressive, and dominant than in Portland: Seattle, for example, or San Francisco or New York City, or almost any large industrial city in America.

To date the municipal affairs of only one American community have been thoroughly probed by the committee. That is the municipality of Portland. One possible inference from this is that Portland has the most corrupt municipal government in the Nation, or the local government which is the most dominated by the teamsters union. Such an inference is wholly unwarranted by the facts. For example, the committee published a list of 35 vice and night spots allegedly operating illegally in Portland. I doubt if such operations had anything to do with labor-management relationships, but they were published, nevertheless, with much fanfare. When is the committee going to make a similar compilation of such alleged unlawful night life in San Francisco and Seattle and Chicago? Or is this kind of activity of importance to the United States Senate only when it happens in Portland and nowhere else?

As a native son of Portland, as well as a Senator from Oregon, I merely urge the select committee to give perspective and balance to its investigation, by undertaking exactly the same scrutiny of other communities which it made of Portland. That would not only be fair to the good name of Portland, but it would assure balance to a probe which has been assumed to be national in scope. According to Mr. Davies, of the New York Times, Dave Beck ascended to great heights of dominance and affluence in the civic life of Seattle. No comparable ascendancy by Mr. Beck or any other teamster official was shown in Portland. Yet it was the government and social fabric of Portland which were probed for many weeks by the committee and not that of Seattle.

I am not trying to tell the select committee what to do. Its members are far more experienced in the Senate and in handling investigations than I am, for I am not an investigator in any sense of the word. I realize the committee has had a legitimate duty to probe any corruption in labor-management relationships, but surely the mandate of the committee is not circumscribed geographically so that it applies exclusively to Portland, Oreg. I simply am saying that a committee with an assignment which is nationwide in latitude should not investigate only the government and affairs of one community out of the dozens of great cities in the United States, particularly a community which is essentially as law abiding, home loving, and generally placid as Portland. To confine the investigation only to Portland, and nowhere else, would be a distortion which I am sure does not do justice to the basic purpose and goal of the distinguished chairman of the committee and his able colleagues.

Unless I am totally mistaken, there is less real vice and corruption in Portland than in the majority of large American cities. I feel certain that the same searching examination of other communities as was made of Portland would demonstrate this fact beyond peradventure of a doubt.

ARMED FORCES DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 18, the Nation will observe Armed Forces Day, under a proclamation issued by President Eisenhower. Throughout the land there will be military parades and appropriate ceremonies and many installations of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and other agencies will be open to public inspection.

American citizens will have an opportunity to see at first hand some of the tremendous new weapons which have been developed since World War II. They will see some of the highly skilled young men who have been trained to operate these new instruments of modern warfare.

By this observance of Armed Forces Day, we will show our own citizens and those of other lands that the United States is militarily strong and progressive. We can stimulate our people to think about the difficult decisions which

have to be made by our military and civilian leaders and the Congress to make sure that we have adequate military capabilities to deter an aggressor from making any attempt to attack us, and to retaliate if an attack should be made.

We must have capable leadership, adequate physical facilities and equipment and the men to operate them. It is just as important that our citizens remain determined and courageous if our country is to retain the strength which is so necessary until there is a permanent peace in the world.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], relating to Armed Services Day. It is a day in which every American should take an interest. Americans should learn something about the work of our men in uniform, and the various types of equipment which it is necessary for them to learn to use.

A little while ago I placed in the RECORD a statement which was published in the Army and Navy Journal of 90 years ago, to the effect that offense and defense depend more upon the knowledge the individual has of his weapons than upon the weapons themselves.

Personally, I feel that the only way we can all become acquainted with proper military defense is for every boy in America to have basic military training.

I hope that my colleagues will carefully read the statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for adding to my statement. I know how much interest he takes in the military, and how much of his life has been spent in the military service, and in thinking about military problems.

NATIONAL AND INTER-AMERICAN MUSIC WEEK

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I think it was Shakespeare who said:

The man that hath no music in himself,
Nor is not mov'd with concord of sweet
sounds,
Is fit for treasons, stratagems, and spoils.

Mr. President, last week there was held in Washington a very fine luncheon in celebration of National and Inter-American Music Week.

A series of awards were presented to those who have rendered outstanding service to the cause of music, including the famed singer, Miss Marian Anderson.

The awards were presented, appropriately enough, by the Honorable Sherman Adams, Assistant to the President, himself a deeply interested friend of American music.

The principal address was delivered by Mrs. Agnes Meyer, chairman of the District Auditorium Commission. Mrs. Meyer pointed out the magnificent potentialities for service of American culture through the National Auditorium and Civic Center, which will arise in the Foggy Bottom area, some years hence.

I am delighted that Congress has now given the green light toward the commission's acquisition of the necessary

land in this area, so that the commission can then proceed with the national raising on a national scale of voluntary funds for the purpose of construction of the center itself.

Of course, the specific funds for the real estate must still be appropriated, but I am confident this will be done.

I send to the desk several of the features of the program. They include: The order of events on the program itself, the remarks of Mr. Ralph E. Becker, chairman of the luncheon committee, and then the statement by Mrs. Meyer on the American Accropolis.

Mr. Becker's comments, I may say, were very apropos because they pointed out how America's cultural efforts vividly refuted the hostile condemnation which had been made of our culture by Dmitri Shepilov, former Soviet Foreign Minister.

Finally, I include, as an indication of the type of Soviet propaganda which we are constantly encountering and as an illustration of what Mr. Becker had in mind, the text of a New York Times story of April 4. It describes Mr. Shepilov's characteristically unfair and inaccurate statement of American culture.

I ask unanimous consent that this contrasting material which speaks for itself be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I congratulate those responsible for National and Inter-American Music Week and hope this type occasion will enjoy continued great success.

There being no objection, the program, remarks, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL AND INTER-AMERICAN MUSIC WEEK

Honorary chairman: The Honorable Sherman Adams, the assistant to the President.

Honorary vice chairman: The Honorable Robert McLaughlin, President, District of Columbia Commissioners.

Honorary vice chairman: Mrs. Ralph Becker.

Executive committee chairman: Mr. Philip A. Guarino.

Executive secretary: Mr. Clinton Price.

Treasurer: Mrs. Edward Cleaveland Sweeney.

Publicity: Mr. Nathan Lerner.

Tickets: Mr. Richard A. Terrell.

Producer and director of the Gypsy Baron by Johann Strauss: Dr. Frederick Fall.

Willard Hotel, May 6, 1957, sponsored by the Cultural Development Committee of the Washington Board of Trade, the Greater Washington Music Council, and the District of Columbia Recreation Department.

PROGRAM

Invocation: Rev. Gilbert V. Hartke, O. P.

Welcome: Mr. Ralph E. Becker, chairman, luncheon committee.

Toastmaster: Mr. M. Robert Rogers.

Introduction of the head table

The Honorable Sherman Adams, Miss Marian Anderson, Miss Richard Bales, Mr. Ralph E. Becker, Mr. Paul Callaway, Mr. Milo F. Christiansen, Dr. Hobart Corning, Maj. Hugh J. Curry, Mr. E. R. Finkenstaedt, Mr. Lloyd Geisler, Mr. Philip A. Guarino, Mr. Patrick Hayes, Col. George Howard, Mr. Sam Jack Kaufman, Hon. David B. Karrick, Hon. Thomas Lane, Miss Vanett Lawler, Dr. Warner Lawson, Hon. Robert E. McLaughlin, Mr. George Marek, Dr. Howard Mitchell, Mrs. Agnes Meyer, Dr. Jose Mora, Mrs. Merriweather Post, Mr. M. Robert Rogers, Dr. Harold Spivacke, Mr. George Titus, Mr. Pierson Underwood.

Presentation of awards: The Honorable Sherman Adams.

Honorees: Mr. Paul Callaway; Mrs. Merriweather Post; Mrs. George Titus; Dr. Warner Lawson; Mr. Patrick Hayes; National Symphony Orchestra, Dr. Howard Mitchell; men and women of the National Symphony Orchestra, Mr. Lloyd Geisler; Organization of American States, Dr. Jose Mora; Opera Society of Washington, Mr. E. R. Finkenstaedt.

Speakers: Mrs. Agnes Meyer, Mr. George Marek.

Guest artists: Mr. Dean Dittman, tenor (Zeupan of the Gypsy Baron); Miss Joan Harrison, harp soloist; a Barnee Breeskin production, Sheraton Hotel Quartet, leader, Jerry Rodis.

Groups affiliated with National and Inter-American Music Week

American Federation of Musicians, Local 161, Mr. Sam Jack Kaufman.

Alexandria Civic Orchestra, Dr. Wendell Margrave.

American Guild of Organists, Mr. Temple Dunn.

American University, Mr. James McLain.

Campbell Music Co., Mr. Thomas Ikeler.

Catholic University, Mr. John Paul.

Citizens Committee for Music in Public Schools, Mrs. Elmer Klavans.

Composers Club, Miss Mary Howe.

Corcoran Art Gallery, Mr. Henri Dorra.

District of Columbia Music Educators Association, Mr. Hendrik A. Essers.

District of Columbia Public Library, Mr. Melville Osterthe.

District of Columbia Public Schools, Dr. Paul Gable.

District of Columbia Teachers College, Mr. John Wigent.

Friday Morning Music Club, Mrs. Quinta Frey.

Friday Morning Music Foundation, Mrs. Florence Howard.

Georgetown University, Mr. Paul Hume.

George Washington University, Dr. Robert Harmon.

Greater Washington Music Council, Mr. Pierson Underwood.

Howard University, Dean Warner Lawson.

Jewish Community Center, Mr. Edward Rosenblum.

Jordan Music Co., Mr. E. T. Isbell.

Kitt Music Co., Miss Frances Jones.

Library of Congress, Dr. Harold Spivacke.

Montgomery County Light Opera Co., Mr. Thomas Jones.

National Association for Composers and Conductors, Mrs. Virginia R. Collier.

National Federation of Music Clubs, Mr. James Reistrup.

National Gallery of Art, Mr. Richard Bales.

National Opera Guild of Washington, D. C., Inc., Mr. Curt C. Schifeler.

National Symphony Orchestra Association, Mr. Carson G. Frailey.

Opera Society of Washington, Mr. E. R. Finkenstaedt.

Pan American Union, Mr. Guillermo Espinosa.

Phillips Gallery, Miss Elmira Bier.

Society of Arts and Letters, Mrs. Robert E. Kline.

Society for the Encouragement and Preservation of Barber Shop Quartets, Mr. Demetri Paris.

Super Music Attractions, Mr. Irvin Feld.

The Treble Clef Club, Miss Cecelia Jefferson.

United Community Services, Mr. Philip Amran.

United States Army Band, Maj. Hugh J. Curry.

United States Navy Band, Cmdr. Charles Brendler.

United States Marine Band, Capt. Albert Schoepper.

United States Air Force Band, Col. George Howard.

Washington Board of Trade, Cultural Development Committee, Mr. George Titus.

Washington Cathedral, Mr. Paul Callaway.

Washington Guild National Negro Opera Co., Mrs. Mary Dawson.

Washington Music Teachers Association, Miss Raissa Tselentis.

Women's Committee of the Corcoran Gallery.

Women's Committee for the National Symphony Orchestra, Mrs. Cyrus Ching.

Young Women's Christian Association, Miss Sara McConnell (General luncheon committee).

NATIONAL AND INTER-AMERICAN MUSIC WEEK

(Speech of Ralph E. Becker, May 6, 1957)

Governor Adams, Miss Anderson, members of the committee, and fellow music lovers, on behalf of the cultural development committee of the Washington Board of Trade, the Greater Washington Music Council, and the District of Columbia Recreation Department, I wish to extend a warm welcome to all of you who are here to salute National and Inter-American Music Week. The very fact that this luncheon is being held and that we have in attendance many of those responsible for the great American music of today, musicians, critics, patrons, and friends of our musical culture, is moot refutation of a recent attack on American music by the former Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Dmitri Shepilov.

According to the New York Times coverage of Mr. Shepilov's statement, the United States industrial establishment and engineering prowess came in for high praise, while our cultural life was painted as base and devoid of beauty and melody. Rather than counter Mr. Shepilov's assertions by a chapter and verse recitation of the present high state of American music, I want to point up a striking difference in the respective audience participation in good music between the two countries.

While none will deny the eminent caliber of Soviet music in several media such as the Russian ballet, the audience participation in the Soviet Union is limited to the privileged Communist upper crust who can afford the extravagant admission charges. The great mass of Russian people denied access to the several great conservatories and without the benefit of mass electronic communication such as radio and television, never share in the fruits of the work of Soviet musicians. To use only a recent example, some 40 million Americans watched on their television screens a brilliant performance of Beethoven's *Fidelio* and this year as for the last 17 years, tens of millions of Americans have spent their Saturday afternoons at the Met via the radio broadcasts sponsored by what Mr. Shepilov referred to as "one of the great capitalistic oil monopolies."

Without discussing many other advancements of American musical culture, this one development, mass commercially sponsored fine music, has brought to the individual in the United States more opportunity to participate in fine music than his counterpart in any other country in the world, and it is indeed a tribute to the social and civil consciousness of "our great tyrannical monopolies" that they have taken the lead in bringing good music into every American home.

The speakers who follow me today, wittingly or unwittingly, will refute the bitter and unfounded attack by Mr. Shepilov.

A note of irony appears from Mr. Shepilov's statement in his allusion to American music as consisting of nothing but boogie woogie and rock and roll. While I will not personally comment on the relative merits of this phase of American music, I would like to note in passing that the records most in demand in Leningrad and selling at an almost prohibitive price are those of Elvis Presley.

It is now my distinct pleasure to turn over the luncheon to your distinguished toastmaster, president of Washington's good music station, one of the prime movers on the President's Committee for Arts, Sciences and Education, a composer in his own right who set the President's inauguration prayer to music, and one of those to whom I referred as making fine music readily available to so many Americans—Mr. Robert Rogers.

THE NATION'S CULTURAL CENTER
(Remarks of Agnes E. Meyer)

I am grateful for this opportunity to speak simultaneously to the Washington Board of Trade and the Greater Washington Music Council about the importance to our Nation of the National Cultural Center. For it is only by the combination of these interests, business and the arts, that the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission can successfully carry out the great responsibility assigned to it by the Congress, with the approval of the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House, who appointed the members of the Commission.

My friends, this venture has more than national importance. For it will surely capture the imaginations of all free peoples when it becomes known to them that our political leaders of both parties are determined to build in our Nation's Capital a magnificent complex of buildings, as the focus and inspiration for the arts and sciences, for important national and international gatherings, and for the broadest and deepest education of the American people.

Never was such a project more important than at this crucial period in our Nation's history when our Republic must lead the world in the defense of freedom. "Freedom for what?" the foreign nations are now asking us with passionate concern, since they have been made far more aware of the shortcomings of our society than of its deep and lasting virtues, virtues that are difficult to explain to peoples who have never experienced the subtle educational values of the democratic process. Our allies as well as our enemies accuse us of an obsessive preoccupation with purely material achievements. There is just enough truth in this arraignment to put us on the defensive. Yet we should never be apologetic about our magnificent technological superiority and the high standard of living it has produced. For our high per capita productivity has deeper roots than mere desire for more and more possessions. It could have never come about without a capacity for hard work, whether of mind or body, and a positive devotion to human welfare and progress such as no other nation has ever achieved.

At the same time, we must realize that the test of our democratic society lies in its ability to give leadership to the world in the realm of ideas, and that the freedom of which we boast will not be convincing to other nations unless its finds expression in cultural manifestations of enduring value and thus in the flourishing amongst us of the arts and sciences. We must recognize as clearly as the Greeks who developed the first democracy under Pericles, that the spirit which freedom engenders is a greater power than all our material resources and achievements.

It is obvious, therefore, that the new cultural center we wish to build must reflect by its architectural splendor, by its setting and dignity, the highest ideals of the American people. Just as the Acropolis of Athens still expresses the universal and permanent values of ancient Greece, so our cultural center must convey to our people and to all mankind the most significant and most enduring values of modern democratic civilization.

What, therefore, are the factors that must receive prime consideration if these high pur-

poses assigned our Commission are to be carried out in a worthy manner? Because of its importance to our Nation and to the prestige of our Nation in foreign lands, not only the sheer beauty of this complex of buildings, but its setting, its surroundings, and its visibility from a distance are of major importance. Because our Commission was keenly aware of all these esthetic factors, we were, with the exception of one member, in favor of the only beautiful site left in Washington, in Foggy Bottom, just north of the Lincoln Memorial. The Congress long ago recognized the value of this beautiful piece of property, for it authorized that it should be reserved for public buildings. This noble site also has many practical advantages that are important to the people and to the various business interests of Washington. It is close to the city's population centers, to the hotels, and easily reached by existing transportation facilities. This would improve the income potential of the center and also increase the business of our hotels and shops. The underground parking space of the center—big enough for 2,000 cars—would be helpful to the adjacent offices of the new State Department, to George Washington University, and other public buildings already in existence or planned for this area. This would bring in a steady revenue for the center and revenue is of great importance, for once constructed the center must pay its way.

Ladies and gentlemen, there were great obstacles to be overcome before we could be sure that this site could become available for the Commission's use. But the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the National Planning Commission, and the businessmen who had in good faith bought some of the property, were so cooperative that there is no longer any doubt that together we shall work out a satisfactory and exciting solution of our problems.

Now let me try to envisage for you how majestic our American Acropolis will look on the rising slopes of the Potomac. Close to the Lincoln Memorial, the White House, and other monumental structures, our building would lend these other public edifices an additional splendor. Visitors will approach the center from the Potomac River side on a broad entrance stairway. Their first impression would be gained by a view of the Court of States, featuring a reflecting pool bordered by colonades. In the center of the pool will be a fountain. High flag staffs, bearing the flags of the 48 States, will surround the pool and be reflected in it. On both sides of the entrance stairway tall colonades will stretch across the entire front of the center. Entering the building, the visitors will see the Tourist Information Center, where trained experts will give them an historical background of the Nation's Capital and the interrelationship of the various Government or other public structures. We shall also develop moving pictures outlining the Nation's history which will make the visits of the millions of Americans and foreigners who come to Washington annually far more vivid, meaningful, and educational.

Directly in front of the main entrance is the auditorium-music hall, seating 3,800 to 4,200 people. Careful study of the acoustics should make it possible to hear even the softest musical notes in every part with the same freshness and distinctness. To the left, a theater seating about 1,400 can be used not only for dramatic performances, but for more intimate musical and dance events. Both the music hall and the beautiful theater are greatly needed in Washington. Foreign visitors have been shocked that the Capital of America has never had proper facilities for the arts, music, dance, and so on. Our American orchestras and theatrical groups have often visited foreign countries, but we have not been able to receive those of other countries in Washington for lack of ade-

quate facilities. We are confident that the music hall and theater will win approval as America's finest examples of theater architecture and for the flexibility of their backstage arrangements.

Of all the various buildings that comprise the National Cultural Center, the great hall will probably dominate the others. It will have an unobstructed floor space of 100,000 square feet, providing ample space for the inaugural ball, civic receptions, conferences of national and international importance, organizational conventions, exhibitions, and other events.

As our Commission was keenly aware that this place of assembly will be the setting for many historical events now that Washington is the capital, not only of the Nation, but of the whole free world, our planning board gave special attention to its dignity, scale, proportions, and design. At one end a hydraulic elevator, the full width of the hall, will raise a floor section to form a stage for ceremonial occasions. Two balconies on either side of the hall will contain rooms for smaller meetings. Movable chairs, stored close by when not in use, will provide seating for over 10,000 persons. Flanking the great hall and visible through its windows will be two landscaped areas that will add to its beauty. The building will contain a restaurant and a coffee shop for visitors to the Center.

How, you will surely wish to know, is so vast a project to be financed—the purchase of the site, the plans for construction, and finally the \$36 million needed for the execution of the plans?

Despite the arguments concerning the national budget, the Commission hopes that the Congress will be sufficiently enthusiastic about the prospect of a cultural center for Washington to help us acquire the site during this session. Since drawing the plans will take at least 9 months, this will give our Commission time to raise enough money to begin immediately the construction of the so-called inaugural hall. Once the project gets underway, the Commission will have to work hard to drum up the amount needed for its completion. We cannot succeed in this campaign unless we stimulate interest in the cultural importance of the center throughout the Nation. To help us reach the public, the Commission has already set up a council of sponsors, made up of organizations of the arts and sciences, as well as commercial agencies, that will actually want to make use of the center for their activities. All these various national or State organizations will serve as liaison between us and the public, raise what funds they can, but chiefly put in motion the nationwide impetus needed if we are to get the bulk of our funds from foundations, industrial leaders, and individual donors.

One feature of the Cultural Center, which I have not yet mentioned, is bound to create nationwide enthusiasm. This is a mass communications system which will make it possible to beam all notable events taking place in the Cultural Center throughout the country by means of radio, television, and motion pictures. Each building will be planned to provide camera and microphone installations, together with wiring, lighting, and acoustical arrangements designed to provide the highest quality reproduction. Thus, schoolchildren in their classrooms and people in their own sitting rooms throughout the land will be able to see historical pageantry in the great hall via closed-circuit TV. Music lovers may share distinguished operatic or other artistic performances. As never before, Americans will feel they are participating in that unique event, the President's inaugural ball. In short, the Cultural Center will belong to all the American people and become an important influence in their daily living and thinking, a source of inspiration and the highest happiness.

Now a word to the members of the board of trade. Gentlemen, you will recognize at once that this Cultural Center will benefit the businessmen of Washington in many different ways. But as I have just explained, this Cultural Center will be used to stimulate interest in the arts and in all creative endeavors throughout the country. A new vitality will permeate the whole Nation, a spontaneous zest for living which will be reflected in a new faith in ourselves and our destiny as a people.

Therefore, the Washington Board of Trade could perform a great service to the future of our country, if you will interpret the significance of the Cultural Center to the boards of trade in every major city throughout the country. Gentlemen, our Commission can never raise the \$36 million needed for the construction of this modern American acropolis without the active cooperation of the businessmen. And I am sure you will agree with me that we cannot, we must not, fail to carry out this all-important mandate given us by the Congress. With your help we can prove to the world that we Americans are not crass materialists, but a people living on a new continent determined to create a new culture and a new concept of man and his destiny.

SHEPILOV ASSAILS MUSIC OF THE UNITED STATES—CONDEMNNS "NERVOUS, INSANE ROCK 'N' ROLL" AND GENERAL LEVEL OF CULTURE

Moscow, April 3.—A gathering of Soviet composers heard today a scathing attack on American music from Dmitri T. Shepilov.

Mr. Shepilov, a secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, also denounced what he described as the general lack of culture in the United States.

While praising the United States engineering genius and its huge industrial establishment, Mr. Shepilov said, "While visiting New York you feel in everything the tyranny of private enterprise."

He said he felt during his only visit to New York last year "this powerful technology created by human beings is turning the workers into cogs of a machine."

Mr. Shepilov said that in the midst of skyscrapers, which he said belonged to oil, steel, and aluminum monopolies, there was "a dirty, old building." That was his description of the Metropolitan Opera House. He said the Metropolitan continued in existence only through contributions and that its talent was largely imported from Italy, West Germany, and France.

DISCUSSES FINE ARTS LINE

Mr. Shepilov was addressing the congress of Soviet composers, which has been meeting in Moscow for a week. Since his removal from the post of Foreign Minister in February and his return to party work, Mr. Shepilov has been active in party propaganda relating to the fine arts.

Mr. Shepilov said that in the United States, "this richest imperialist country," there were "only five opera houses, which barely subsist." He said they were open only 1 to 5 months a year.

The party secretary was bitter in his discussion of modern United States music. He said the music heard in parks, restaurants, and dance halls had nothing in common with the "kind of music we are accustomed to."

"All this nervous and insane boogie woogie and rock 'n' roll are the wild orgies of cave-men," he told the composers. "They are devoid of any elements of beauty and melody. They represent an uncontrolled release of base passions, a burst of the lowest feelings and sexual urges."

[According to word received by the New York Times last February 3, Elvis Presley records are the newest craze in Leningrad. The disks, cut on discarded hospital X-ray plates, sell for 50 rubles a copy. That is

\$12.50 at the official rate of exchange. Mr. Presley's recordings may be obtained in this country for less than \$1.]

UNIFICATION OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FACILITIES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have just learned that the President, in his press conference yesterday, expressed the opinion that some action should be taken to enforce the so-called O'Mahoney rider to the Defense Appropriation Act of 1952, requiring the unification of the procurement facilities of the various subdivisions of the Department of Defense.

When I was chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I discovered that the Navy, the Army, and the Air Force were buying separately many of the same items, and that great surpluses were being built up and great expenditures were being made which could easily be saved.

After much discussion and research, both in the House and in the Senate, which was carried on by the Bonner, Hardy, and Hébert subcommittees and by the Senate Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, of which I was chairman, Representative BONNER, of North Carolina, who was very much interested in the problem, entered into an agreement with me, and the so-called O'Mahoney rider was introduced and passed.

It became the law of the land, reading as follows:

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and for the purpose of achieving an efficient, economical, and practical operation of an integrated supply system designed to meet the needs of the military departments without duplicating or overlapping of either operations or functions, no officer or agency in or under the Department of Defense, after the effective date of this section, shall obligate any funds for procurement, production, warehousing, distribution of supplies or equipment or related supply management functions, except in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense.

(b) This section shall be effective 60 days after the approval of this act.

I was very much surprised, after a leave of absence from the Senate, to learn, upon returning to Washington as a Member of this body, that the law requiring the unification of the procurement operations of the three subdivisions of the Department of Defense was not being enforced.

I am happy, therefore, to be advised that in his press conference yesterday the President indicated that something now should be done about this problem.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the comments of the President at this press conference, together with the question which was asked. I may add that the provision which I introduced, and which is now the law has been endorsed by the Hoover Commission on several occasions. The latest of these may well be said to have been the visit of former President Hoover on President Eisenhower yesterday. Mr. Hoover is quoted as having told the President that he estimates the Government could save between \$5 and \$6 billion by adopting the recommendations of the Commission on

Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. It is interesting to note, by the way, that President Harry Truman called Mr. Hoover from private life to become Chairman of this Commission. My point now is only that one of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission is the enforcement of the provisions of the O'Mahoney rider.

The issue was raised in the President's press conference yesterday when Mr. James Reston, of the New York Times, addressed the President and received the President's answers in the following manner, as reported in the New York Times this morning. The text is as follows:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPORTER OF UNIFICATION

James Reston, of the New York Times: "Going back to the budget, sir, some observers, some very well experienced men, including your old friend, Vannevar Bush, have said on the budget that the problem is essentially the old question of the unification of the services, the elimination of duplication, the agreement upon a strategic plan, and so on. Could you comment on that, and give us your impression of what progress has been made on that?"

Answer: "Well, as you people, some of you here, you older ones, may know, in 1946 and 1947 I was a great supporter of unification."

"I had come back from a war where I had responsibility of commanding all services, dealt with all services, and I thought the day of the separate services was really gone. And I thought we could bring this about. Well, I encountered a very fierce opposition, but I stuck to my guns."

"Now, there never was produced a law that, I believe, would have been the best, because there was nothing in that law that gave anyone, any one official, the specific job of uncovering all of the possible duplications, making certain that we were—all of our logistics and supply problems were met in the most economical manner."

"Now, I think Mr. Bush, Dr. Bush, may be overestimating to some extent the savings that are to be made there. But I still believe they are considerable, and if we could today get rid of service prejudices, to the point of such things as real unification in hospitalization and doctors, in depots where it can be done, and distribution, supply, procurement, a lot of these things, I believe there was—there is a chance to save money."

"Now, this, of course, has its limits. After you are purchasing in a certain amount it doesn't save a great deal to purchase in double that amount except as it eliminates the competitive factor."

"If you and I are both trying to get 5,000 blankets, and there is only one factory making blankets on a very limited scale, we would run the price up against ourselves very hurriedly. That kind of thing could be eliminated."

"But progress is being made, that is the hopeful part about it. Progress is being made, but it is not as fast and it is not as complete, and I certainly hope when I was preaching and praying for unification, which never did take place quite in the form that I thought it should be."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I note the presence in the Chamber at this time of my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I should like to propose an inquiry to him.

I assume that the Senator from Delaware is aware of the request which I made last evening for consideration of the Commerce Department Appropriation bill tomorrow, when the Senate will convene at 11 o'clock. Is that agreeable to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is agreeable to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The supplemental appropriation bill is ready, but certain Members on the minority side are unable to be present, and they asked that consideration of that bill be deferred until next week. It is our plan to bring it up on Monday of next week, or the early part of the week. Is that agreeable to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask these questions because the Senator from Delaware is always very cooperative with the leadership. However, he is a watchdog, and very studious with respect to appropriation bills. He looks for every opportunity to eliminate nonessential items. I wish to be sure that I reciprocate the cooperation which he always extends.

We are hopeful that next week 3 or 4 more appropriation bills will be reported. I serve notice now that they will have the highest priority. It may be necessary for the Senate to adjust its daily meeting schedule, even to the extent of remaining in session into the evening, and perhaps being in session on the weekend. I want all Senators to be on notice of that statement. The leadership will try to avoid night sessions and will also try to avoid Saturday sessions as long as it is possible to avoid them. But the Senate will meet to act on proposed legislation which comes from the committees. I want the RECORD to show that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I assure the Senator from Texas that, as one Member of the Senate, I shall be glad to cooperate with him at all times in expediting the consideration of measures before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Delaware does not need to assure the Senator from Texas of that fact. The Senator from Delaware has demonstrated it repeatedly by his action.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely wish to add that some of us feel that bills and reports ought to be available to us at least overnight, so that we may study measures which are to be considered and prepare ourselves before they are debated on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Certainly. The Senator from Texas has given the Senator from Delaware such assurance, and he will repeat the assurance at this time, and he will personally see to it that the Senator has available to him the hearings, the report, and the bill.

DEFERRED GRAZING

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me at this time. I have already asked my question of the Senator from Arizona, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. HAYDEN]. However, I know the interest of the Senator from Texas in the subject of deferred grazing, covered by Public Law 85-25, which was known as H. R. 2367. That bill contained an authorization, but I understand there are no funds presently available for the program the act contemplated.

Can the Senator from Texas tell us whether a deficiency appropriation bill will contain such an item?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am sure we will have such appropriation bills from time to time. The great deficiency, as I see it, lies in the administration of the Department of Agriculture. I have appealed to the Secretary personally, which is something I rarely do, to please try to bring about a recommendation from administrative officials of his Department, so as to put some kind of program into effect under the legislative authority which has been provided. If such a program was ever needed, it is needed now.

I have just returned from my home State of Texas, where there have been some terrific rains. In many areas there is not a cover of grass but a cover of weeds, although, under the cover of weeds, there is a little shading of green fuzz, which may in time become grass. However, if we turn goats and sheep and cattle on to that cover, the land will be in the same condition it was before the rains came.

So I appealed to the Secretary last week, and I also talked to one of his assistants—I believe it was Mr. Scott—later in the week. I understand that they are arranging some meetings, and that the Secretary is attempting to get some officials of the Department to make a recommendation, so it will be possible to decide just what kind of program is to be provided.

However, nothing definite has been determined as yet. I believe they have scheduled a meeting in Denver, and perhaps one in Cheyenne, and perhaps one also in Dallas. Such meetings have been scheduled, as I understand, though I may be mistaken about the cities.

Mr. CARLSON. I believe I may be able to help the Senator a little on that point. I, too, have talked with Mr. Scott, of the Department of Agriculture. I talked to him today, and he informed me that the meeting in Dallas has been held; it was held on Tuesday. The State of Kansas, the one State with which I am particularly familiar, is in this position: The State ASC has allocated areas, and a program has been worked out. It has the approval of the Dallas office and also of the Department in Washington, as I understand; but no funds are available. I am also advised—although I do not know whether I am exactly cor-

rect in this—that an application has been made for \$25 million in a deficiency appropriation bill.

In the light of what I have learned, if anything is to be done about the situation—and certainly something should be done about it—I urge that action be taken promptly to include that sum in a deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have discussed the matter with Mr. Scott. I talked to him the day before yesterday. He was not aware then that a meeting had been held in Dallas or that one was going to be held there. I told him that I had been advised the previous week that a meeting was due to be held there either that day or the day after, or that a meeting had been held the day before. He said that perhaps he was in error and he would like to check into the matter. At that time they had not prescribed any standards that are to be used. If they have done so since then, I have not been informed, although I asked him that I be informed.

The Senator from Kansas is the author of the basic legislation. I will say to him that if the Secretary of Agriculture will make a recommendation to us as to the standards which are to be used, and what kind of program is to be established, and will go to the country and let the ranchers know that this program will be available, and then ask for funds to carry the program into effect, the Senator from Texas will be very sympathetic toward such a request. Certainly the Senator from Texas will demonstrate much more aggressiveness than the Department of Agriculture has demonstrated.

Mr. CARLSON. I merely wish to state that so far as Kansas is concerned, we are ready to proceed. The program has been established and has been approved. I know the Senator's interest in the subject, and I want to help him get the money which is necessary. However, it will be up to him, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, to see to it that the money is provided early enough to do some good. It will be necessary to get it early if it is to be of any avail.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator have available the Secretary's request?

Mr. CARLSON. I do not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator know when it was made?

Mr. CARLSON. I believe it was 2 or 3 days ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If it has taken the Secretary 30 days to make it, I am sure I can dispose of it in less time than it took the Secretary of Agriculture to make the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk state the nomination of Mr. Bennett on the Executive Calendar. Then I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, so that Members may be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the first nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Elmer F. Bennett to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. My friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, is present and, I understand, desires to address himself to the nomination now pending. I yield the floor for that purpose.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Do I understand correctly that the Senate is now considering the nomination of Elmer F. Bennett, of Colorado, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have not made a major issue of this nomination. I have not requested a ye and nay vote, nor do I intend to do so. However, I believe the RECORD should indicate what I regard as a very basic policy of discrimination and unfairness against a major region of the United States. Mr. Bennett has been a symbol and a leading advocate of that policy, and I think the RECORD should make clear the facts at issue.

I shall vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Elmer F. Bennett, of Colorado, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior, because Mr. Bennett has been actively supporting a policy of total discrimination against the Columbia River Basin with respect to water resources development.

Mr. Bennett is an admitted adherent of the so-called partnership program of the administration. Under that program, the administration is advocating the expenditure of over \$800 million in the Colorado Basin but no new Federal authorizations whatsoever on the Columbia River and its main tributaries.

The administration has opposed authorization of the great Hells Canyon project; it has declined to include 1 cent in its record \$72 billion budget for the great John Day project. Both of these sites are in the Columbia Basin. By contrast, the Interior Department has just signed the largest dam-building contract in history—\$107 million—for Glen Canyon Dam on the Colorado.

The Colorado River carries 17 million acre-feet of water to the sea; the Columbia River carries 180 million acre-feet of water to the sea.

As one of the Senators from the basin of the Columbia River, I shall not vote to confirm the nomination of an official who has supported this policy of outright discrimination against my region—or to place this official in a still more strategic position to perpetuate the inequities and injustices of that policy.

I have nothing against Mr. Bennett as an individual nor against his character—only against the basic public policy here at stake.

I desire the RECORD to show that I shall vote "No."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to inform my friends of the minority that if they intend to have me get the President's nominations confirmed, they will have to vote a little louder than they did with respect to the last nomination. At least, I appeal to the good judgment of my colleague in the chair. [Laughter.]

I ask that the President be immediately notified that the nomination has been confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

STUDY OF CRITICAL RAW MATERIALS AND RESOURCES OF THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The morning hour having been completed, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 78) to make a study of critical raw materials and resources of the Soviet Union and certain Eastern Hemisphere countries and the effect upon the United States.

USE OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS, STATE OF IDAHO

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 289, S. 1794.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1794) to amend section 6 of the Act approved July 3, 1890 (26 Stat. 215), relat-

ing to the admission into the Union of the State of Idaho by providing for the use of public lands granted therein for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, or other permanent improvements of public buildings at the capital.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If my colleagues will indulge me, and if my friend, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] will bear with me for just a few minutes, I shall make brief explanations of a few bills which are scheduled for consideration. Then I shall yield the floor so that my friend from Montana may address the Senate. I am very desirous of hearing the Senator from Montana speak. I wish to follow his address, and I hope he will accommodate me, so that the Senate may proceed to consider 4 or 5 measures which I desire to bring up, and which will take but a short time.

Mr. MURRAY. I shall be happy to accommodate the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my friend from Montana for his unfailing courtesy.

By its enabling act, the State of Idaho was granted 50 sections of unappropriated public lands within its borders, the revenues from which were to be used "for the purpose of erecting public buildings at the capital of said State for legislative, executive, and judicial purposes." S. 1794 enumerates the specific purposes which the committee feels were intended to be accomplished by the application of land-grant revenues to public buildings, even though the language of such original grant to the State of Idaho was, unfortunately, restrictive rather than comprehensive.

A similar bill was passed for Wyoming last week; similar bills were passed earlier for Montana, Washington, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

I think the proposed legislation is desirable; there is ample precedent for it. Similar action has been taken with respect to other States. I would not want to see discrimination practiced against the great State of Idaho. I hope the Senate will pass the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1794) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act relating to the admission of the State of Idaho into the Union be amended to read as follows: "That 50 sections of the unappropriated public lands within said State, to be selected and located in legal subdivisions as provided in section 4 of the act, shall be, and are hereby, granted to said State for the purpose of erecting public building at the capital of said State for legislative, executive, and judicial purposes, including construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, and any other permanent improvement of such buildings and the acquisition of necessary land for such build-

ings, and the payment of principal and interest on bonds issued for any of the above purposes."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect as of July 3, 1890.

TRANSFER OF TITLE TO IRRIGATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 291, S. 413.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 413) to provide for transfer of title to irrigation distribution systems constructed under the Federal reclamation laws upon completion of repayment of costs thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. S. 413 is identical to S. 2217 reported favorably by the committee in the 84th Congress, 2d session, and passed by the Senate on July 2, 1956. The bill proposes to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer title to distribution systems of Federal reclamation projects under certain circumstances to local water users' organizations upon two specific conditions: (a) That an organization representing the water users concerned shall have requested the transfer; and (b) that the Secretary shall find that the water users or the organization have completed repayment of all construction and other charges, with the exception of operation and maintenance charges not yet due, which are obligations with respect to the distribution system concerned. Under existing reclamation law, no provision is made for the transfer of title to distribution works upon completion of repayment from the United States to any organization until provided by Congress. That statute is 32 Statutes 389.

The bill avoids any reference to the transfer of dams or other supply works as distinguished from irrigation distribution systems. The reason for this omission is that the question of transfer of dams or headworks involves considerations of national policy, as well as interstate considerations and should be taken up in connection with matters of broad national policy affecting water resources and their use.

Mr. President, the bill is strongly recommended by the Department of the Interior. I think it may be well for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to give prompt consideration to the prospects of applying this general policy to the transfer of dams or wherever headworks are involved.

In my own great State of Texas we were actually prevented from constructing, or it was necessary to postpone the construction of, very vital public works in the Panhandle area, largely because of the question of where title would vest.

I call this matter to the attention of my distinguished colleague [Mr. YAR-

BOROUGH], who is in the chair, and who has had a wealth of experience in this field, he having been an original member of one of the great water-conservation agencies of the Southwest, the Lower Colorado River Authority. I express the hope that he, too, will become interested in this general field, because I know of no State in the Union which could benefit more by the reaching of an understanding between the Federal Government and the State government in the field of water conservation than could our own State.

For many years the Federal Government has been active in the field of flood control, water conservation, irrigation, and public power. I hope we may have a coordinated policy which will bring all the strength of the local, county, and State governments to join with the Federal Government in that endeavor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon request of an organization representing the water users of any project or division of a project constructed under the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 688, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), the Secretary of the Interior shall, if he finds that said water users or their organizations have completed payment of all construction and other charges, except future operation and maintenance charges, which they or it are obligated to pay under said reclamation laws with respect to their distribution system, transfer to the organization or to any other entity designated by it and capable of receiving the same title to said distribution system or to such portion thereof as is useful solely to said water users. The Secretary shall likewise transfer title to any portion of such a distribution system which is useful to two or more groups of water users or organizations thereof upon their joint request when he finds that payment of all charges, as aforesaid, has been completed. Any such transfer shall be accompanied by the transferee's acceptance of all liabilities, duties, and obligations, which the United States may theretofore have incurred with respect to the distribution system, and the transferee shall agree to save the United States harmless with respect thereto and with respect to all future claims, liabilities, obligations, or duties arising out of the construction, operation, or maintenance of the distribution system transferred. Unless the care, operation, and maintenance of the system to be transferred has already been turned over to the transferee, any such transfer shall also be accompanied by the transferee's acceptance of such care, operation, and maintenance. As used in this act, the term "distribution system" is inclusive, to the extent to which the Secretary finds the same to be appropriated in any particular case, not only of works and structures for the delivery of water but also of drains, lands, interest in land, equipment, supplies, and records relating to said distribution system: *Provided, however,* That where the distribution system or a portion thereof is located upon lands within a national forest or other lands administered by the Secretary of Agriculture necessary rights-of-way only shall be granted therefor subject to such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture finds necessary for the adequate protection and utilization of the national forest or other lands.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized to provide in all contracts hereafter negotiated under the Federal reclamation laws for transfer of title to distribution systems in accordance with the terms of section 1 of this act.

SEC. 3. This act shall be a supplement to the Federal reclamation laws.

COMPACT RELATING TO APPORTIONMENT OF WATERS OF THE LITTLE MISSOURI RIVER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 292, Senate bill 1556, granting the consent of Congress to an interstate compact. My friend the distinguished acting minority leader, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] is very much interested in this measure; and whenever he is interested in a measure, that assures its immediate consideration, insofar as the majority leader is concerned.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1556) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interest in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Little Missouri River and its tributaries as they affect such States, and for related purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to make a brief explanation of the bill. However, my friend the Senator from North Dakota probably is better equipped to do so than I am. If he will explain the bill, he probably will be more effective in doing so than I would be.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, the pending bill will permit the States of Wyoming, Montana, South Dakota, and North Dakota to enter into a compact to resolve the various interests of the States with respect to the Little Missouri River.

A similar bill was passed unanimously last year by the Senate. It has the support of all the Senators from the four affected States, and also that of the Governors of the four affected States.

I believe that is sufficient explanation, unless questions are to be asked by any Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1556) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of the Congress is hereby given to the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and

Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the interests of such States in the development, protection from pollution, and the use of the water resources of the Little Missouri River and its tributaries, and providing for an equitable apportionment among them of the waters of the Little Missouri River and its tributaries, and for matters incidental thereto, upon the condition that one qualified person appointed by the President of the United States shall participate in such negotiations as chairman, representing the United States, and shall make a report to the President of the United States and the Congress of the proceedings and of any compact entered into. Such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless or until the same shall have been ratified by the legislature of each of the respective States, and consented to by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) The Federal representative shall be appointed by the President, and shall report to the President either directly or through such agency or official of the Government as the President may specify.

(b) The Federal representative shall receive compensation and shall be entitled to travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as provided for experts and consultants under sections 5 and 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 and the Travel Expense Act of 1949, except (1) that his term of service shall be governed by the terms of this act and shall not be affected by the time limitations of said section 15, and (2) his per diem rate of compensation shall be in such amount, not in excess of \$100, as the President shall specify, but the total amount of compensation payable in any one calendar year shall not exceed \$15,000: *Provided*, That if the Federal representative be an employee of the United States he shall serve without additional compensation: *Provided further*, That a retired military officer, or a retired Federal civilian officer or employee, may be appointed as such representative without prejudice to his retired status, and he shall receive compensation as authorized herein in addition to his retired pay or annuity, but the sum of his retired pay or annuity and such compensation as may be payable hereunder shall not exceed \$15,000 in any one calendar year.

(c) The Federal representative shall be provided with office space, consulting, engineering, and stenographic service, and other necessary administrative services.

(d) The compensation of the Federal representative shall be paid from the current appropriation for salaries in the White House Office. Travel and other expenses provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall be paid from any current appropriation or appropriations selected by the head of such agency or agencies as may be designated by the President to provide for such expenses.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

PRINTING OF ANNUAL REPORT, NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 294. Senate Resolution 136.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 136) to print the 59th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the resolution merely provides that the 59th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ending April 1, 1956, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

Mr. President, I hope we may be able to agree to the resolution without any involved discussion, because I believe no great contribution would be made by our becoming involved in an argument about a matter of this kind.

I deplore the divisions which have been created during the last few days by reviving the Civil War. I think all of us could better occupy our time by devoting ourselves to the problems of today, and certainly to the problems of the future, rather than by attempting to sack the generals who long ago passed on. To attempt to do so might establish a precedent which we would not wish to establish; and in the years to come, even some of the generals might regret the establishment of such a precedent.

Mr. President, pursuant to the act of February 20, 1896, the Daughters of the American Revolution, through the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, make an annual report to the Congress. The annual reports have been printed as public documents since the year 1897. The resolution provides for the printing of the most recent report of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mr. President, the organization is a very fine one, and it meets with rather general approbation. So I urge that the resolution be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 136) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the 59th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1956, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO LULA B. GREEN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 295, Senate Resolution 135, to pay a gratuity to Lula B. Green.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 135) to pay a gratuity to Lula B. Green.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the resolution would provide a gratuity to Lula B. Green, widow of John A.

Green, who at the time of his death was a messenger in the office of the Sergeant at Arms. The amount of the gratuity will be approximately \$1,790. The action proposed is in line with the ordinary practices of this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be submitted, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 135) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Lula B. Green, widow of John A. Green, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 5 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 296, Senate Resolution 122.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 122) to print as a Senate document certain proceedings of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the resolution provides for printing as a Senate document, with additional copies, certain proceedings of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee containing a statement by J. Edgar Hoover relative to the Communist Party. To print as a Senate document, the cost will be \$212.90; the 122,000 additional copies will cost \$1,194.38.

Mr. President, I am informed that there is great demand for this publication; and I am sure that the very able and wise statement by the respected public servant, J. Edgar Hoover, will be of great interest, and I think it will have a very wholesome effect on our population.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 122) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the proceedings of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on March 12, 1957, wherein the subcommittee received a statement of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, analyzing the 16th annual convention of the Communist Party of the United States, be printed as a Senate document.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed 122,000 additional copies of such Senate document for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF FINAL REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 297, Senate Resolution 130.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 130) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the final report of the Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the resolution authorizes the printing of additional copies of the final report of the Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions. (3,000 additional copies cost approximately \$1,200.)

The resolution was submitted by the very able and distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and has been reported by the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING].

I hope the resolution will be agreed to. The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 130) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions 3,000 additional copies of the committee's final report to the Senate, made pursuant to Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress, and Senate Resolutions 47 and 128, 85th Congress.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF INTERIM REPORT OF COMMISSION ON INCREASED INDUSTRIAL USE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 299, Senate Resolution 131.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 131) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the interim report of the Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment in line 5, after the word "document", to insert a comma and

"and that 6,500 additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the interim report of the Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products, submitted to the Congress April 17, 1957, pursuant to Public Law 540, 84th Congress, be printed as a Senate document, and that 6,500 additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the resolution authorizes the printing as a Senate document of the interim report of the Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products. To print as a Senate Document the cost would be \$1,730.17. The 6,500 additional copies provided for in the committee amendment will cost approximately \$1,200.

Mr. President, I am not in a position to pass judgment on the damage which would be done if we did not provide for the printing of all the additional copies requested. However, I express the hope that the committee involved and the Senators requesting additional copies will be aware of the cost thus incurred; and in this year of economy and savings, I hope they will be as prudent as possible in the requests they make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 131), as amended, was agreed to.

ROCHAMBEAU MEMORIAL BRIDGE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to have the Senate consider a bridge bill, Calendar No. 321, S. 768, to which I am informed there is no objection.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 768.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 768) to designate the east 14th Street highway bridge over the Potomac River in the District of Columbia, as the Rochambeau Memorial Bridge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to designate the east 14th Street highway bridge over the Potomac River as the "Rochambeau Memorial Bridge." After the enactment of this proposed legislation, any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such bridge is mentioned shall be held to refer to such bridge as the "Rochambeau Memorial Bridge." I ask that the bill be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 768) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the east 14th Street highway bridge over the Potomac River from a point near 14th Street in the District of Columbia to a point in Virginia shall be known and designated hereafter as the "Rochambeau Memorial Bridge." Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such bridge is referred to shall be held to refer to such bridge as the "Rochambeau Memorial Bridge."

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 290, S. 999.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 999) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the State of North Dakota for the use and benefit of the North Dakota State School of Science.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4897) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1544) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States situated in Cobb County, Ga., to the trustees of the Methodist Church, Acworth, Ga., and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a very important announcement to make to the Senate. Earlier in the week the Senate passed the Treasury-Post Office Department appropriation bill. It was the first appropriation bill to be passed by the Senate this year. As the result of a motion the senior Senator from Texas made in the Committee on Appropriations, we reduced the bill by \$32 million from the

amount reported by the subcommittee. The vote on the motion of the Senator from Texas was conclusive.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], reported the bill to the Senate. After extended debate, the Senate in its wisdom passed that bill without reducing the appropriations recommended or adding a dollar. When the bill was sent back to the House, where it had originated, it contained an amendment that had been added by the Senate committee. It was a flexible amendment which would permit the Treasury Department to exchange 5 percent of its funds by transfers between appropriations, with the approval of the Budget Director, and with the requirement that they report such action to the appropriate committees of Congress. That was the only change that had been made in the bill, a rather unusual situation.

The House considered the amendment which had been placed on the bill by the Senate, and concurred in the amendment, with an amendment of its own, which I shall now read to the Senate. The amendment provides:

Provided, That no transfer made under this authority shall result in increasing any appropriation in excess of the budget estimate as presented in House Document 16, 85th Congress.

That is a further limiting factor.

I may say that the necessity for this amendment arose because substantial reductions had been made in the appropriations of the Treasury Department. The distinguished Secretary of the Treasury was attempting to operate within those appropriations, since the budget estimates had been reduced; but in order to do so, he needed the flexibility which this amendment would give him. In order to create incentive and in order to encourage Cabinet officers to try to follow the will of Congress, the committee attempted to comply with the Secretary's request for flexibility.

The House is willing to go along with the amendment, provided the transfers do not result in spending more money than the Bureau of the Budget had recommended. This is a further limitation, and I think a very wise one.

I am informed by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the chairman of the subcommittee, that the proposal by the House is agreeable to him.

I think the amendment which the Senate adopted was a good one. In my opinion, the addition made by the House does not materially change it; if anything, it strengthens it. I think it would give the Secretary the flexibility which he needs. I commend the Secretary for his desire to attempt to cooperate, and to operate his Department within the limits given him by Congress.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate, in the hope that this, the first departmental appropriation bill for the ensuing fiscal year, can be passed quickly and sent to the White House for the President's approval, so that the good people of the country may know that we

have saved \$80,364,000 in the first of the 15 appropriation bills to be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on the amendment of the Senate to House bill 4897, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
May 16, 1957.

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4897) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes," with an amendment, as follows:

At the end of the Senate amendment, add the following: "Provided, That no transfer made under this authority shall result in increasing any appropriation in excess of the budget estimate as presented in House Document 16, 85th Congress."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee, I see nothing offensive in the language which was added by the House to the transfer clause which was written into the bill by the Senate. As a matter of fact, that language is quite common; it is not uncommon that a limitation is made, so that in no case can any of the title provisions be increased beyond the estimate for the fiscal year.

Moreover, the language does not interdict the consideration of a supplemental or a deficiency appropriation bill, if after the necessary investigation and exploration by the Post Office Department they present their case to the Budget Bureau for further consideration by Congress, either before Congress adjourns, or when it returns in January.

I anticipate, of course, that the Bureau of the Budget, after making further examinations of the problems of the Post Office Department, will probably send to Congress a supplemental budget which can be considered entirely on its own merits. So the language of the transfer clause will in no way restrict or interdict the consideration of a supplemental bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The language of the general provision applies only to the Treasury Department, and was requested by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I concur wholeheartedly in what the distinguished acting minority leader has said, although I would not, by any effort of mine, wish to encourage anyone to think that we would look sympathetically upon any supplemental requests, unless they were absolutely necessary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not trying to convey that impression at all, I assure the distinguished majority leader. I have just heard the language read; I had not seen it. But I wanted to be absolutely certain that while we make it apply, in the first instance, only to the Treasury Department, sometimes it is included in the general provisions, so that it applies to every item in the bill. I merely wanted to make it clear that while I do not anticipate that the Treasury De-

partment will make a request for a supplemental appropriation, since they concurred in the House recommendation in the first instance, in no wise would the case of the Post Office Department be prejudiced at some later date.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope the attaches of the Senate will take prompt action in connection with the proposed legislation and that it will be sped to the White House at the earliest possible time.

Mr. President, if my friend the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is prepared to address the Senate, I shall yield to him.

HELLS CANYON, HUNGRY HORSE DAM, AND THE COLUMBIA RIVER POWER SYSTEM

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss a matter of very serious importance with regard to the full development, conservation, and wise use of the vast natural resources of the United States.

On April 4 the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] inserted in the RECORD a statement entitled "Comments on Hells Canyon Project." I have so much respect for the judgment and wisdom of my good friend from Utah that, after studying this document, I wonder if he gave it his careful attention before placing it in the RECORD.

The statement constitutes an attack on the entire program of Federal resources development in the Northwest, plus allegations that the program subsidizes various industries in the region. I was surprised and disappointed with my colleague's approach to the problem. His approach, if fully carried out, would divide the Northwest from the rest of the country and treat it as a separate entity, which of course it is not. The Senator from Utah has not heretofore displayed such provincialism in his approach to natural resource development. No such attitude was evident in his excellent work for the great Upper Colorado development, and he will recall that I supported his efforts to get that project underway.

In his statement in the RECORD on April 4, the Senator from Utah spoke of "the loquacious spokesmen" for the Northwest, and predicted that "supporters of Federal power for the Pacific Northwest are going to come out kicking and squealing" at his attack on Northwest development. I can only assume this reference and this prediction must have been leveled at me—along with other Senators—because for over 20 years in this body we have worked, and upon occasion fought, for the full development of the water resources both of the Northwest and the Nation, including hydroelectric power.

This is an age when energy—and today this means electric energy—is increasingly the major controlling factor in the economic development and welfare of the Nation. Under these conditions, I will

never support or condone the underdevelopment of any of the hydroelectric resources which constitute our only truly inexhaustible source of energy. Our fossil fuels may someday be depleted; even atomic power may someday be limited by declining reserves of the proper fuels to activate reactors; but so long as the snows melt in the mountains and the rivers flow to the sea, our hydroelectric plants will continue to pump lifegiving energy into the economic bloodstream of the Nation.

THE MORAL ISSUE AT HELLS CANYON

Any development of such a great water resource to less than its maximum economic potential constitutes a tragic loss to our people and weakens the whole Nation. This is true not only during the 50 years of the pay-out period, but for the whole life of the project, perhaps centuries. Some may find ways to salve their consciences for permitting such a crime against unborn generations, but I cannot, and will not, be a party to it.

This is the moral issue in the case of Hells Canyon, and the sooner the people's representatives recognize this, and stop discussing it as if it were merely a matter of public versus private power, the better the national welfare will be served. To ignore this is to be blinded by prejudice and propaganda, and to turn our backs on the basic fundamentals of what is right and what is wrong in the development of our God-given natural resources.

SENATOR WATKINS' STATISTICS

The Senator from Utah fell into numerous errors of both fact and conclusion in his statement. In pointing some of them out, I have no wish to cast doubt in any way upon his sincerity or good faith, but I believe it is absolutely necessary to demonstrate how terribly mistaken he is, lest his statements stand unchallenged and be accepted as fact.

The Senator stated that the Corps of Engineers had informed him that they had expended some \$930 million on flood control and navigation projects in the States of Oregon and Washington, roughly one-seventh of the national total. I am unable to have this figure verified from any official source as the flood control and navigation costs related to the Columbia River program.

FLOOD CONTROL EXPENDITURES

There are flood-control projects and flood-control projects. Some of them, such as levees, provide no benefit but flood control, and can never repay their cost save by the protection they give; they are a permanent, nonreimbursable investment in the general welfare. But there does not appear to be \$930 million invested in such works in connection with the whole Columbia Basin program. The Senator's statement itself indicates a much smaller total. At another point it gives us a grand total of \$1,866,402,214 invested in the Columbia River power system, of which only \$118,538,209 is allocated to flood control and navigation—less than 7 percent of the total. Only this amount, plus the amount allocated to irrigation and a very small amount allocated to recreation, is nonreimbursable in the basin power system; all the rest of the total figure will be repaid with interest within 50 years

from power revenues, and after that period those revenues will be almost pure profit to the United States. The Northwest will pay for the system and the whole Nation will retain title. What a gilt-edged investment that is!

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] gives \$50,590,356 as the total allocation of costs to flood control in the Columbia River Basin. Imagine that—in all the years since we started building flood-control projects we have only built \$50 million worth in the Columbia River Basin. A single flood in 1948 inflicted more than \$100 million worth of damage there, twice our total investment in protection. Does the Senator from Utah really think this expenditure in the Columbia Basin is exorbitant? Obviously, it is not even adequate. Fifty-two people lost their lives in the flood of 1948. We must invest several hundred million dollars in additional flood-control projects before any repetition of such disasters can be prevented with any assurance, and I intend to continue to work to obtain such funds as long as I am in the Senate of the United States. I sincerely hope the Senator from Utah will reconsider his position and support flood control, on a basis of need, in both the Northwest and Utah.

Even if Washington and Oregon did get 15 percent of the Army engineers' total nationwide expenditures, is it not a grievous mistake to think in terms of individual States as if they were separate countries instead of just areas of one great Nation? Where should we spend our money on water resource projects? In the arid areas where there is no water? Or where the water is?

Money is spent to develop copper in Montana because there is copper in Montana. It is spent to produce salt from the Great Salt Lake because there is salt there and not in Lake Michigan or Lake Erie. It is spent on water developments in the Northwest because our second mightiest river is there.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire if the Senator from Montana is familiar with these dramatic flow figures on the Columbia River:

The Columbia River empties more water into the sea than any other river on the continent except the Mississippi itself. Its annual flow averages 180 million acre-feet of water, more than 10 times the flow of the Colorado River, in which the Senator from Utah is so justly interested. Its maximum flow has been some 9.3 million gallons per second, and only as recently as 1948 it flooded at over 7½ million gallons per second.

Where would the Senator from Utah have funds for flood control and navigation spent, if not in the river basins where flood control is needed and navigation possible? The projects now under construction in the Missouri and Colorado Basins will provide storage to contain approximately 5 times the annual flow of those rivers, yet all projects

now under construction or completed in the Columbia Basin will bring the total flood-control storage in that basin to less than 5 percent of 1 year's annual flow. Does this really sound as if the Northwest is getting more than its share of flood control appropriations? I refuse to believe this is what the Senator from Utah really means—storage equal to 500 percent of annual flow for the Colorado and the Missouri Rivers, but only 5 percent for the Columbia.

An absolute minimum of 27 million acre-feet of flood control storage is required for any degree of effective flood control in the Columbia River Basin. Yet the region has only about one-third of the minimum needed. And, I would like to add, little progress is now being made toward achievement of an adequate flood-control goal for the Columbia because of the present administration's hostility to starting construction of new multiple-purpose river projects.

Resource development under sponsorship of the Federal Government must and can occur only where there are resources to develop. The Government does not undertake navigation projects in inland Nevada, nor irrigation works in the rain forests of the Olympic Peninsula where precipitation averages over 120 inches a year. But the Federal Government does develop irrigation projects in the great Western deserts, and navigation projects along our coast and inland waterways. Likewise, the Federal Government has—in the past—provided the impetus for building of power projects in the Columbia Basin, where lurks nearly 40 percent of the water-power potential of the United States. Sound governmental policy calls for expenditure of funds for projects where the power, navigation, and irrigation potential exists. And that is the policy we are fighting today to preserve in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the eminent Senator from Montana for the able and important speech he is making in the Senate. This contribution is characteristic of the Senator's continual leadership in this whole vital realm.

Mr. President, I wish also to state to the Senator from Montana that he occupies the rather unique geographical distinction of having, in part, represented in the United States Senate for many years a great State, which I believe is traversed by the Continental Divide of the majestic Rocky Mountains between the Columbia River Basin and the Missouri River Basin. The entire record of the Senator from Montana shows that he has fought for full development of the Columbia River Basin, the Missouri River Basin, and also the Colorado River Basin.

I note that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is now present in the Chamber. If I am not mistaken, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and I have all supported the upper Colorado project, in which the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] has been so rightfully interested. We supported it, even though very few of the benefits will go directly to our own States. We are all interested in the development

of that vital realm of the intermountain West, so we never thought of it on the basis of any local consideration whatsoever. Certainly for that reason I am disappointed that the distinguished senior Senator from Utah, who has advocated pouring nearly a billion dollars of Federal funds into his own region, is so hostile to the development of the Columbia River Basin.

I know—and considering the long career of resource development of the senior Senator from Montana, I am sure he agrees—that if the Western States are to go forward, they must go forward together. For representatives in the Congress from one Western State to lead the fight against the development of another Western State, in the long run, can only lead to the downfall and dismay of all the Western States. That is the reason why I am so appreciative of the broad gage, statesmanlike attitude which the senior Senator from Montana, as chairman of the very strategic Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has taken toward the development of all the Western States and all the great river basins within the Western States.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his very interesting remarks, and the very valuable points he has raised. During the course of my remarks, I was touching on them, inadequately, and I am very much pleased that the Senator has brought them out so effectively.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I rise to join with my colleague in paying my respects to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the distinguished Senator from Montana.

I have said on many platforms of America what I should like to say here about the Senator from Montana. I have said that the people of the United States do not have a more effective or sincere or ardent defender of the people's heritage in their own natural resources than the senior Senator from Montana. Once again today the Senator from Montana is demonstrating that when he feels a wrong has been done, he does not hesitate to do what he can to put the record straight, according to his sights.

I speak with complete respect for the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. The Senator from Utah and I simply disagree fundamentally on the whole approach to the basic Northwest natural resources problem. The Senator from Utah and I expressed different points of view in Salt Lake City last Saturday at the conference of Western States on water resources. I shall in my own time, in due course, proceed to set the record straight, as I see the record, with respect to some statistical information which the Senator from Utah used in his Salt Lake City speech last week, statistics identical with information being propagated by the private utilities, to the effect that Bonneville power, for example, is being sold for less than its cost. I said in Salt Lake City—and I say here today—the facts do not bear out that

contention on the part of the Senator from Utah.

But what I wish to address myself to at this moment, by way of interruption, because the Senator has reached that point in his speech, is an observation. The Senator, for example, has just said:

Money is spent to develop copper in Montana because there is copper in Montana. It is spent to produce salt from the Great Salt Lake, because there is salt there and not in Lake Michigan or in Lake Erie. It is spent on water developments in the Northwest, because our second mightiest river is there.

I wish to enlarge upon that point, if I may, and point out, as a part of the Senator's speech, that when expenditures are related to the proportion of water resources in an area, it is doubtful that the Northwest has had its fair share of the appropriations.

I become a little tired of hearing the charges which are being made by selfish groups in some parts of the country to the effect that we, in the Pacific Northwest, are getting more than our fair share of appropriations. In the first place, we are not. In the second place, whatever appropriations go to the development of the power resources of the Pacific Northwest and the conservation of other natural resources in the Pacific Northwest, help every citizen of the country, no matter where he or she lives, whether it be in Maine, Florida, Pennsylvania, Ohio, California, or any other State, because only to the extent that we conserve our natural resources, and carry out the doctrine of trusteeship preached by Pinchot and Teddy Roosevelt, and leave our natural resources in better condition than that in which we found them, will we keep faith with future generations of American boys and girls. I stress that point as I now place in the RECORD, with the permission of the Senator from Montana, certain figures.

For the information of the Senator from Utah and other like-minded Senators, I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point a small table. It is taken from Geological Survey Circular 367, entitled "Developed and Potential Water Power of the United States and Other Countries of the World, December 1954." It is very informative.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State	Available 50 percent of the time	Available 90 percent of the time
	Percent	Percent
Washington.....	20.33	19.44
Oregon.....	10.51	10.33
Idaho.....	6.85	6.93
Montana.....	3.92	4.24
Pacific Northwest.....	41.61	40.94

Mr. MORSE. The figures given show the percentages of the national potential water power which are located in the four States of the Northwest. The figures are as follows: For Washington, available 50 percent of the time, 20.33 percent; available 90 percent of the time, 19.44 percent. For Oregon, available 50

percent of the time, 10.51 percent; available 90 percent of the time, 10.33 percent.

For Idaho, available 50 percent of the time, 6.85 percent; available 90 percent of the time, 6.93 percent.

For Montana, available 50 percent of the time, 3.92 percent; available 90 percent of the time, 4.24 percent.

The figures show that, for the total Pacific Northwest, encompassed by the States I have mentioned, there is available 50 percent of the time, 41.61 percent; available 90 percent of the time, 40.94 percent.

What do those figures mean? If the Senator from Utah and others will examine the figures, they will notice Oregon and Washington, the two States which he thought were getting such an excessive proportion of national expenditures for water resources development because they get 15 percent of such expenditures, actually have within their boundaries 30 percent of the Nation's total potential water power, the one investment which pays its way in cash, and returns to the Treasury of the United States many times its cost to the taxpayers.

So far as the dams are concerned, the dams of the Columbia River system are ahead of their payout schedule today. Could it be that we are really not giving the Northwest its fair share of the appropriations, rather than giving it more than its fair share, as has been charged?

If the Senator from Montana will permit me, I should like to buttress his speech by stressing again what the Senator has heard me stress so many times, but which cannot be repeated too often.

What is our problem in regard to natural resource conservation? Fundamentally, it is a problem of conserving water. If I were asked to name what I think is the greatest domestic need of the American people today, my answer would be that the American people should wake up, before it is too late, to the great need of conserving America's water supply. America's water table is going down; and with that table going down, America's civilization will go down, not in our lifetime, but it is inescapable if we do not stop the falling water table.

All I have to do is to send the reader to the library to read the sorry tale of history. When nations do not protect their water supply, they cease to climb the ladder of civilization. Consider the cases of China, Persia, and the Middle East. Believe it or not, the fallen civilizations in the history of mankind happen to be the civilizations in which there are always one common element, namely, the failure of the people to conserve their natural resources, and particularly their water supply.

In the Middle East today, there is under vegetation a little less than one-fourth the land area which was under vegetation when that area was the home of great civilizations.

In China there are thousands of square miles of eroded topsoil and deforested mountains, and a falling water table. There are physical facts. I plead with the American people to remember those facts as the Senator from Montana leads the Senate, as he has done for so many years, in the great fight for the conserva-

tion and protection of our natural resources, in the tradition of Gifford Pinchot and Teddy Roosevelt, and of George Norris, Hiram Johnson, Clarence Dill, and other great Senators who preceded the Senator from Montana in this body.

The Senator from Montana, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is warning the American people once again, in answer to the claims of the Senator from Utah, that now is the time to protect the natural resources of the United States.

As I said in Salt Lake City last Saturday, and repeat here today—and my colleague has made reference to it—I made a fight on the floor of the Senate for the upper Colorado River project, against strong opposition in my State. Senators should read the mail which I received. I was asked, "Why are you fighting for the upper Colorado project, when some Western Senators are blocking Hells Canyon Dam?"

I do not serve in the Senate on the basis of any theory of blocking something that is good merely because I am unable to obtain support for something else which is likewise good. I do not believe in that kind of legislative process.

I fought for the upper Colorado project because I think it is a sound project from the standpoint of conserving our water supply. I went there and inspected the area. I noted, for example, that large segments of that region were already water disaster areas. In Denver, Colo., there is water rationing for several weeks in the year, because of a falling water table. I knew the time had come to take action on the upper Colorado project, and I supported it.

I would be less than honest if I did not express keen disappointment that the Senator from Utah and some other Western Senators from the opposition party have been helping to block Hells Canyon Dam, which is just as sound and just as much needed for the future use of American boys and girls as the upper Colorado River project. But I will not take the position that I will join in any so-called disciplinary procedure to prevent some other good project from developing, just because the Senators interested in it are too narrow in their vision or too provincial in their view to support a magnificent project like Hells Canyon. Such a position would simply contribute to the anarchy in western development which is being fostered by the views of the senior Senator from Utah in fighting against full development of the water resources of the Columbia Basin, and I will have no part in it.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the able Senator from Oregon. He has made a very valuable contribution to this discussion. His statements cannot be questioned. They are on the record, and no one can dispute them.

On April 20, 1955, during the upper Colorado debate, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] knew that expenditures depend on the location of the resources to be developed. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has discussed that in some detail, and has made it very clear.

The Senator from Utah told the Senate then:

Navigation, flood control, and hydroelectric generation are similarly located where there is water—not in the desert.

SOME STATEMENTS CORRECTED

Having listed the allegedly tremendous expenditures for flood control and navigation projects in the Northwest, the Senator from Utah says:

These expenditures, furthermore, were first costs only. No estimate was provided on the planning and operation and maintenance costs for those projects. This continuing overhead expense, largely assumed by the Federal Government under these two programs, could amount to hundreds of millions of dollars during the lifetime of these projects.

I am almost embarrassed to have to answer such statements. My good friend from Utah knows better if he will only consider a bit. For instance, I am sure he is really aware that planning costs of these projects are included in what he calls first costs—the initial investment in the project.

He must be aware that the cost of operation and maintenance of the great power projects he is talking about—Bonneville, The Dalles, McNary, Chief Joseph, and the rest—are not an additional expense to the Government. The distinguished Senator's own statement says at one point:

A total additional payment of \$170 million has gone into the Treasury, but it has gone toward payment of operation and maintenance and interest.

The Senator from Utah would be more accurate if he told how well our projects are paying their own way, instead of accusing them of being a load on the Federal Treasury. All flood control and navigation projects anywhere in the Nation are nonreimbursable. Power projects repay their costs. They are not a cost to the taxpayers. Besides returning the investment in their construction with interest, they stimulate the economy of the area, stimulate industry, and tremendously increase tax collections from the corporations and newly employed workers.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I believe a quotation from the remarks of the Senator from Utah should be inserted at this point. He was speaking of the Colorado River storage project on the Senate floor on August 19, 1954, when he said:

The resulting productivity of the area served by the project, besides providing the money to repay all the reimbursable project costs, also will furnish tax revenue estimated to be far in excess of the total cost of the project every 50 years.

Let me say that that is likewise true of such great projects as we are fighting for in the Pacific Northwest, like the Hells Canyon Dam.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for his statement.

People who oppose Federal investment in resources development preach a philosophy that would keep America perpetually in the pre-McKinley, horse-and-buggy days. If we are going to ac-

cept the philosophy behind criticism of the great projects that have stimulated the economy of the Pacific Northwest, then we ought to rescind authorization of the upper Colorado project right away. And if we cannot afford to invest in self-liquidating public works, we ought to stop building highways and ride bareback as of old, for we cannot afford non-reimbursable public works either!

NO FEDERAL GRATUITIES INVOLVED

It is impossible to stand idly by while the Senator from the upper Colorado refers to Federal gratuities involved in Northwest projects and the size of the outstanding indebtedness. An investment which will be repaid with interest, including the full amounts required for operation and maintenance, is surely not a gratuity.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] says that "during the first 15 years of operation the Columbia Basin has paid off only \$170,409,916 on its total net capital investment." He fails to point out that exactly 2 years before the end of the period he mentions, at the end of fiscal 1952, there were in operation in that entire basin only 2 projects which could pay anything back to the Government: Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams. How can projects begin to pay for themselves when they are not even completed?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to place in the RECORD at this point another quotation from the Senator from Utah.

I quote from the hearings on the Colorado River storage project of Wednesday, June 30, 1954, page 312. He said:

If the income from the project overall is enough to repay the costs to the United States and leave something for the people themselves, then it ought to be built.

He is right. I think that is equally applicable to some of the Pacific Northwest projects such as Hells Canyon, which he is now opposing.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for his valuable interposition at this point.

Why were not up-to-date figures used by the Senator from Utah? Total capital repayment at the end of fiscal 1956, as shown in schedule 3 of the 1956 report of the Bonneville Power Administration, was \$202,178,224, which places the entire program some \$77.1 million ahead of schedule on repayments. Imagine that—a Government spending program which not only pays for itself, but is actually over 60 percent ahead of its repayment schedule, in addition to paying, as the Senator from Utah points out, the full costs of operation and maintenance and of interest charges on the unpaid balance. Before this \$202 million was credited to repayment, the Bonneville Power Administration had turned over \$247 million to pay for operation, maintenance, and interest.

I should like to say to the Senator from Utah that if the upper Colorado project ever gets 60 percent ahead of its repayment schedule and matches the record of

the Northwest projects, he will be justified in feeling proud of his part in bringing the upper Colorado into being, just as we who have worked for the Columbia River System development feel proud when we view its achievements.

MR. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Montana, our esteemed chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for the address he is now making. I may say, in this connection, that I think it is a public service to point out that these dams are not impositions upon the taxpayers, as they are so often made out to be by their critics, but, in fact, they are investments in the country and in the future; investments which represent a borrowing from the Treasury, and which will be repaid, with interest, by the dams themselves.

In that respect, I think it noteworthy that the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] himself made the following statement as recently as April 20, 1955, in the course of the Senate debate on the upper Colorado project:

So, Mr. President, by means of this project, we shall accomplish two purposes. First, we shall be able to develop the necessary water; and, second, from the same program we shall be able to develop power at no extra cost to the people of the United States, who will loan us the money, to be repaid over a period of 50 years, for each of the projects.

So it is with the Hells Canyon project: It will be an investment of the public money in the future of the country, and will be repaid, with interest, to the Treasury.

In pointing this out, and in pointing up the fiscal validity of the Bonneville Power System, I say to the distinguished Senator from Montana that, in my opinion, he has rendered worthy public service.

MR. MURRAY. I thank the able Senator from Idaho. I welcome these interjections. I am certain that if we were to search the records, we could fill the Record for many days with quotations from the Senator from Utah which would support the position we have been taking with reference to these projects in the West.

The benefits of the Columbia Basin Power System and the Tennessee Valley Authority to the people of this Nation cannot be measured entirely in dollars and cents, as we have been discussing them.

Without elaborating on the subject, let me remind the Senator from Utah that these two areas made outstanding contributions to winning the last great war. Availability of abundant power in those areas saves tens and hundreds of thousands of young men's lives.

It is not impossible that this Nation may again have to defend itself and the Free World. If that day comes and we find our country harnessed with little, private-owner-company dams, wasting half the energy potential of our great rivers, as at Hells Canyon, those who today are battling for such underdevelopment of our potential power will inevitably have a heavy load upon their consciences.

We should never forget that it is energy—abundant energy—which wins

wars with a minimum of human sacrifice. We must not waste our power resources.

ALLOCATION OF AT-SITE POWER FROM HUNGRY HORSE TO MONTANA

The Senator from Utah has tried to cause dissension among States by alluding to the reservation of at-site power generated at the Hungry Horse project for the State of Montana. The Hells Canyon Dam bill reserves 500,000 kilowatts of power for the State of Idaho, and the Senator bemoans the fate of the poor citizens of Idaho who are thus discriminated against.

At pages 274 and 275 of the hearings held last year by the Interior Committee and a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee on the problems of upper Columbia River development, there are facts which the Senator, in fairness, should have added to his statement about these power reservations.

The power produced at site by the Hungry Horse Dam is 197,000 kilowatts of prime power. Water storage at Hungry Horse adds 613,000 kilowatts capacity to existing downstream dams. Montana actually gets less than 25 percent of the total power attributable to this project.

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

MR. MURRAY. I yield.

MR. MORSE. I note that when the Senator from Utah referred to the Hungry Horse Dam, he used only at-site figures in calculating the cost of Hungry Horse power. I am sure the Senator from Montana agrees with me that we must consider the problem of basin-wide integration in connection with these dams and the control of river flow.

It is interesting to recall that, in times past, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] himself has recognized that; and in that connection I should like to quote from what he said in debate on the floor of the Senate on August 19, 1954. The Senator from Utah at that time asked this question:

Is it not true that the large dams have to be integrated so that the maximum amount of firm power can be produced and the best job can be done in regulating the river and saving water when the water comes down during floods?

Does not the Senator from Montana agree with me that on that occasion the Senator from Utah was correct?

MR. MURRAY. Yes; that is correct.

MR. MORSE. But when it comes to calculating the cost of the Hungry Horse Dam, the Senator from Utah does not take into account anything except the at-site power, and he fails to take into account the integrated power; is not that true?

MR. MURRAY. That is true. In the course of my remarks I shall dwell on that point to some extent; but I very much appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, who has stated the matter in so clear a fashion.

Mr. President, I regret very much that the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is not present at this time to hear these remarks. This morning his office was advised of my intention to allude this afternoon to his April 4 statement. I

am sure he will be interested in reading the Record which is made today, and that at a subsequent time he will have something to say.

What does the next page of the upper Columbia hearings show about Hells Canyon? At-site power produced by Hells Canyon will be 686,000 kilowatts of year-round prime power. Storage of water there will add 187,000 kilowatts of prime power production at downstream dams existing and under construction, including Ice Harbor, McNary, the Dalles, and Bonneville. So the Idaho reservation of 500,000 kilowatts is over 56 percent of new generating capacity attributable to Hells Canyon Dam. Actually, the total production created immediately by Hells Canyon Dam at other dams in the system, including Chief Joseph upstream on the Columbia, will be 274,000 kilowatts for a total of 960,000. Even this larger figure leaves Idaho with 52 percent of the total power production attributable to Hells Canyon.

Twenty-five percent for Montana and 52 percent for Idaho! This is not discrimination against Idaho, and no inflammatory use of half the facts is going to turn the people of the two States against each other.

MR. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Idaho?

MR. MURRAY. I yield.

MR. CHURCH. I would feel remiss, Mr. President, in the performance of my duties as a Senator from the State of Idaho if I did not point out at this time, in connection with the excellent address now being delivered by the distinguished Senator from Montana, my belief that the interests of Idaho are not only fairly dealt with under the provisions of the Hells Canyon bill, but also that the benefits which will be derived by my State from enactment of the Hells Canyon bill will constitute a bonanza for Idaho and an economic stimulus which will contribute tremendously to the future growth and development of Idaho. If it were not for my belief that Idaho's interests are not only adequately safeguarded but also are generously promoted by the bill, I could not in good conscience support it.

I desire to commend the Senator from Montana for the statements he is making in respect to the allocation of power, under the Hells Canyon proposal, for the use of Idaho.

MR. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Idaho. His remarks are very much in point, and I am glad he has made them at this time.

Mr. President, it is an old technique to try to get people divided along man-made lines on the map. But the only way to make sense in dealing with a river basin is to treat the entire basin as a single entity and develop it accordingly with comprehensive planning. This benefits the whole area, and also the Nation, as well. The people know this, and they are not going to fall for the fight-each-other technique.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield again to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Montana has brought out the single-entity theory. It is true, is it not, that the Hungry Horse Dam is only one segment of a particularly comprehensive river-development program? It is not at all an entity, of itself, is it?

Mr. MURRAY. It is not. It benefits the whole area downstream; and it benefits not only the State of Montana, but also the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that when we speak of full development, as compared with partial development, of the river basin, we have in mind the benefits which will accrue from building dams such as Hungry Horse or Grand Coulee or Hells Canyon or McNary or any of the other dams in a total basin development area; and if we are to consider the economic benefits, we cannot limit our statistical analysis to the cost ratio of a given dam, but we must also consider the benefits which will flow from the dam from the standpoint of its effects upon the entire river basin. Is that not true?

Mr. MURRAY. That is absolutely correct, and it is coming to be understood generally by the people of the country, and especially by the people of the West.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Utah understood that fairly well when the Senate was debating the upper Colorado River project.

Mr. MURRAY. Indeed, he did.

Mr. MORSE. He was entirely in favor of that project.

At this point I should like to refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the Senate proceedings on January 11, 1954.

On January 11, 1954, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] requested consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter to the editor of the New York Times, written by Ernest H. Linford, editorial writer of the Salt Lake Tribune. Endorsing Mr. Linford's letter as excellent the Senator from Utah explained that Mr. Linford enjoyed a distinguished reputation for his courageous editorials. The letter, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 1, page 111, reads in part as follows—and I shall now read from the letter which the Senator from Utah so heartily approves:

The upper Colorado River Basin program must be considered as an entity. It is carefully integrated and balanced—as to storage, power links, other use of water and as to repayment to the Government. Eliminating or radically changing one element in the coordinated plan could throw the overall program out of balance, making it economically or otherwise unfeasible.

Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Montana that I completely agree with Mr. Linford's observation. I am glad that at that time the Senator from Utah agreed with it, although the discussion on that occasion was in connection with the upper Colorado River project, of which the Senator from Utah was the author.

Let me say, for the benefit of the Senator from Utah, that exactly the same observation applies to the Columbia River Basin; and the Hungry Horse Dam, which the Senator from Montana has been discussing, is a very vital link in the whole development of the basin of this river in the Pacific Northwest.

I would say to the Senator from Utah that the same observation applies to the Hells Canyon Dam, which he is opposing. The Hells Canyon Dam is a vital link in the full development of the Columbia River Basin. That is why I am taking such an adamant position in opposition to one Dwight D. Eisenhower's proposal for underdevelopment of the Columbia River Basin and for giving away to the private utilities the people's heritage in the full development of that river.

I have said on the floor of the Senate before, and I repeat today, Dwight D. Eisenhower is guilty of a shocking betrayal of a public trust to future generations of American boys and girls by his giveaway policy in regard to the Columbia River Basin, and by his refusal to go along with the Hells Canyon proposal which will provide full development of that section of the Columbia River Basin.

The time has come to draw this issue in language which the American people will understand. When we have a President of the United States who, for example, takes out of the pockets of the American taxpayers thousands, and, yes, millions, of dollars of interest money and gives it free to the Idaho Power Co., it is time that someone says, as I have been saying, that that is political immorality; and it rests squarely on the shoulders of Dwight D. Eisenhower. The time has come to call his tactics what they are.

I want to say that in the Hells Canyon Dam historic debate, which is to open in the Senate of the United States in the next few days, I intend to carry the fight to one Dwight D. Eisenhower, because he is the stumbling block. He is the man who last year had the calls made to colleagues in the Senate to halt Hells Canyon Dam.

There has been an election since. The people of my State made clear what they think of his tactics. The President ought to read the mail I am getting in regard to this unconscionable act of recent days for which he has to take responsibility, when his own ODM, under Mr. Gray, has granted to the Idaho Power Co. something which will cost the American taxpayers millions of dollars.

I do not like to talk quite so roughly as this about a President of the United States, because I have great respect for the Office. But when any occupant of that Office follows the course of action Mr. Eisenhower has followed, representing a betrayal of the public trust, giving away the heritage of future generations of Americans in their own natural resources and letting private utilities dominate his administration, the time has come for someone to use language the people can understand about the man in the White House. I say the time has come for Congress to reverse the shocking betrayal of a public trust of which the President is guilty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his observations. I think the facts we have developed entirely justify his vigorous remarks. There is no question that the President owes a duty to the country to state the problem facing us, and to act upon it with fairness and justice to the people.

I yield now to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I asked to interrupt the Senator from Montana because I think it is most important to call the attention of the people of the United States to the fact that the policy we have been following in recent years with respect to the development of natural resources is fundamentally unsound.

I share the feelings of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Oregon with respect to Hells Canyon, and I supported the Hells Canyon bill in the committee. I shall support it on the floor. However, I wish to call attention to the fact that there is more than water involved. A little later this afternoon, when the opportunity shall be afforded to me, I shall talk about our failure to develop oil shale and coal resources.

I do not know whether it is understood, but the fact is that in the modern world, wars are becoming more frequent and longer, and the periods of peace are becoming shorter.

With the indulgence of the Senator, I should like to call attention to some facts I discovered by consulting the World Almanac the other day. Napoleon captured Moscow on the 14th of September 1812. Three years later he was overwhelmingly defeated, on June 18, 1815, at Waterloo, and he was captured and made a prisoner for life.

The Napoleonic Wars, this record shows, terminated in 1815. There was no additional war in Europe until 55 years had passed. The Franco-Prussian War broke out in 1870. After that war was ended by the triumph of the Kaiser and of Bismarck, Europe had peace for 44 years. That interval of peace was 11 years shorter than that which occurred between the defeat of Napoleon and the beginning of the Franco-Prussian War.

World War I raged from 1914 to 1918 but the interval between the outbreak of that war and the close of the Franco-Prussian War was 11 years shorter than the interval between the Napoleonic Wars and the Franco-Prussian War.

Twenty-one years passed—half the time between the Franco-Prussian War and World War I—and the world found itself involved in World War II. That began in 1939. It terminated in 1945.

We have been on the brink of war ever since. All the peace treaties have not been written. We do not know yet what the fate of Europe is to be, or, indeed, the fate of the world, but we are manufacturing atomic weapons.

We have lost the armaments race. We are not as far ahead of Soviet Russia today as we were in 1945, 12 years ago. Soviet Russia has built a new fleet of submarines. That fleet is greater than the fleet of submarines which Hitler had,

and Hitler's fleet of submarines sank the oil which was being imported into the United States from South America.

Mr. MURRAY. And manganese, too.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And manganese too, as the Senator properly suggests.

We have neglected our own resources. We have spent for the peace of the world the resources we had in great volume. The Mesabi range was exhausted because we made weapons of war of the iron ore in that range—weapons which were sunk in every sea across the world, and which were destroyed on every continent of the world except our own.

We must see now that if there should be a third world war, the fight would be here, or else we are blind. So it behooves us—we who have used our resources with a free and generous hand to win the wars of this century—so to use our water resources, mineral resources, coal, and oil shale as to make certain that our country will not be dependent upon foreign sources of supply for the industrial equipment and the industrial energy which are so essential to our preservation.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure, Mr. President, to note that the Senator from Montana, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is laying these facts before the people of the United States this afternoon. When he has finished I hope to take the floor to talk about a bill which my colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and I introduced 2 days ago to reestablish the Bureau of Mines as an entity in the testing of coal and oil shale for the manufacture of liquid fuels so as to make the United States independent of foreign sources of supply.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for the very fine remarks he has made, which should shock the Nation into a realization of the serious condition that confronts us. I thank him very gratefully.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho is very much interested in water resource development in the Northwest and is in accord with the views expressed by the Senator from Montana concerning the need for arousing the people, so that we may have made a very careful and thorough study and survey of the future development of the great Columbia River Basin. That is why the people of Idaho are particularly concerned about the development of the so-called Hells Canyon area of the middle Snake River.

The Senator from Idaho would be remiss in his duty if he did not express his appreciation to the Senators from the Northwest for the solicitude which they are displaying in regard to this water resource development in Idaho. I should like, if the Senator will yield, to invite attention to the acreage in the Snake River drainage basin, which totals 69,760,000 acres.

There are seven States in the Columbia River Basin. The Senator's State of Montana is in that basin, but unfortu-

nately does not have any acreage in the Snake River drainage basin.

Oregon has 12,922,000 acres, Washington has 3,392,000 acres, Idaho has 46,297,600 acres, Wyoming has 3,270,400 acres, Nevada has 3,577,600 acres, and Utah has only 230,400 acres in the Snake River drainage basin. These figures were compiled by the Chief of Army Engineers and published in House Document 531, 81st Congress.

The Senator from Idaho merely wishes to stress the important fact, in connection with the total acreage in the Snake River drainage basin, that Idaho has exactly two-thirds of the total acreage. So it is peculiar that the Senators from the other States in the Columbia River Basin are so solicitous about safeguarding the interests of Idaho so far as water resource development is concerned. Surely, if Idaho has two-thirds of the total acreage in the drainage area, and provides most of the water, following the suggestion made by the Senator from Montana, that the people ought to become aroused, I can assure him that the people of Idaho are being alerted to the need for conserving and using wisely the water resources of the Snake River Basin under priorities which the State claims.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Idaho for his observations. I am sure what he says will be very carefully studied and considered.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not a fact that the two distinguished Senators from the State of Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senators from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON], the Senators from the State of Oregon [Mr. MORSE and Mr. NEUBERGER], and now the junior Senator from the State of Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], in their approach to river basin development, have not looked to see how many particular acres in their State or somebody else's State were within the confines of some certain river valley? Instead, the Senators whom I have enumerated have felt that all the great river basins of the West and of the Nation should be wisely developed and prudently conserved.

For example, the 2 Senators from Montana, the 2 Senators from Washington, the 2 Senators from Oregon, and the junior Senator from Idaho come from States which are either completely outside the Colorado River Basin, or only inside of it fragmentarily, yet they all have supported wholeheartedly, either as Members of the Senate or as citizens, if they were not in the Senate, the full development, at a very high cost and very great expense, of the Colorado River Basin.

They have not taken the position of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], for example, that he favors nearly \$1 billion worth of development in his own basin, but is leading the fight against any new Federal authorizations or starts in the Columbia River Basin. No. They have taken the broad gage view, as distinguished and character-

ized by the position of the senior Senator from Montana.

To my knowledge, in the slightly less than 2½ years I have been a Member of the Senate, and in the considerably longer period of time in which I have observed these developments as a writer and journalist in the Pacific Northwest, I have never seen the Senator from Montana distinguish one river basin from another on the basis of how many acres in his own State happened to be inside a given basin. The senior Senator from Montana has made his judgment on the measurement of the resources which a generous Creator put in a certain place. If those resources were there, not through any act of some human being but because of the beneficence of the Almighty, and they could be developed for the benefit of America and of mankind, the senior Senator from Montana has favored their development. He has never tried to "Balkanize" our country by pitting one region against another, as has possibly been done by the senior Senator from Utah, as pointed out in the outstanding speech being delivered today by the senior Senator from Montana.

I wish to say to the able senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], speaking for myself as one Member of the Senate and one member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that it is a privilege for me to serve as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under the chairmanship of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I go to him with problems from the State of Oregon, and the Senator from Idaho goes to him with problems from the State of Idaho, just as the Senator's junior colleague goes to him with problems from the State of Idaho, and other Senators go to him with problems affecting the States of Washington, California, Wyoming, Colorado, or whatever the States may be. I have never seen the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] in his consideration of those problems distinguish as to whether or not they affected or benefited his State. He has taken the same attitude, without discrimination and with complete fairness, pertaining to the entire West. I think this is one reason that all of us, regardless of political partisanship, regard the Senator from Montana as a great chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to thank the able Senator from Oregon for his very generous remarks. I do not feel that I am entitled to such commendation, but I have always tried to cooperate with the Senators from all sections of the country in the consideration of their problems and programs. I am sure that all know my heart is in the right place, and I always wish to cooperate in efforts to solve these problems in the interest of the welfare of the people.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join my distinguished colleague from Oregon in commending the senior Senator from Montana, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and In-

sular Affairs. I agree with every word said by the Senator from Oregon, because I know from firsthand experience over a good many years how much the interests of the people have always been in the heart of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from my State.

I may say, also, in looking after the interests of the people of the United States generally, the senior Senator from Montana has never neglected the interests of the people of Montana in particular. This morning in his office he was visited by about 16 members of the various Indian tribes from the State of Montana, to discuss problems affecting their interest. I think he has been a distinct asset and honor, not only to the Senate of the United States, but to the United States as a whole, and most particularly to the State of Montana. I think we owe him a great debt of gratitude for the fine humanitarian work he has done down through the years.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to comment briefly on the remarks made by the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I think the statesmanship demonstrated by both Senators from Montana in their successful advocacy of the Hungry Horse Dam and in their work for that project, when the senior Senator from Montana was in the Senate and the present junior Senator from Montana was in the House of Representatives, symbolizes the fact that all the West can be benefited by a project which may be located in a single State. The Hungry Horse Dam, which happens to be a project within the borders of Montana, has strengthened the entire Pacific Northwest. It has helped to firm up the flow of the great Columbia River. It has taken the crest off some potential floods. It has increased downstream power production in the States of Washington and Oregon. This great project would have been built had it not been for the active and successful promotion of it by the present senior Senator from Montana in the Senate, and the present junior Senator from Montana when he was a Member of the House of Representatives.

It seems to me that the Hungry Horse Dam, which stands as an upstream development in the Columbia Basin, is an example of what could be accomplished if the still larger and greater Hells Canyon project were constructed, not only with benefits to that part of Oregon and Idaho where the project would be located, but with benefits all the way downstream—the benefit of jobs made possible by low-cost power; the benefit of increased economic activity, increased payrolls, and increased tax base, and increased consumption of locally grown farm products all over the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will my senior colleague yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted that the Senator from Oregon has brought up the question of Hungry Horse Dam. I think we know that the leader

in the fight during the years we were fighting for it was the distinguished senior Senator from Montana.

I think it should be brought out that when we advocate multipurpose projects, we are not advocating giveaways. For illustration, Hungry Horse Dam has broadened the tax base. It has furnished 700 jobs in the Flathead Valley, where chronic unemployment used to be the norm every winter. It has brought security, new hope, and new industry.

Furthermore, every dime the Federal Government has put into Hungry Horse Dam and all the other multipurpose projects is repayable with interest.

In addition, I would be willing to wager that every multipurpose project built in the Columbia River Basin will be repaid fully long before the period originally agreed upon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. They are ahead of schedule, so far as payments are concerned.

Mr. MANSFIELD. These are developments in the interest of the people of America. I think we should begin looking after our own people for a change, and give them some consideration. We should develop our resources and give our people some security. We should give our youngsters an opportunity to develop and grow in one of the most important parts of this great Nation.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank my colleague for his kind remarks and for the eloquent illustrations he has given of the benefits of these programs.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho has had the pleasure of serving for more than 6 years as a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, during a part of which time the distinguished senior Senator from Montana has served as chairman. The remarks of the senior Senator from Idaho a few minutes ago in no way reflect any criticism of the chairman of the committee, because everyone recognizes his fairness, and his judicial approach to all the problems affecting the States of the West.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for his observations. I assure him that I have always tried to cooperate with the Republican Members of the committee, and to give them a full and fair opportunity to present their views in every case that has ever come before our committee.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho is in accord with that expression of sentiment, and can frankly say that, so far as the deliberations of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs are concerned, partisanship has usually been avoided as the basis for legislative action.

Mr. MURRAY. I agree with the Senator. I think the Republicans on that committee have cooperated with me. I have great respect for them. I recognize the contributions they have made to the success of the deliberations of the committee.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. A few years ago, when the late Senator Hugh Butler of Nebraska served as chairman of that committee, I am sure that he had the cooperation of the Democratic members of that group in trying to promote some of the programs and solve some of the problems affecting the West.

Mr. MURRAY. He certainly did.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The junior Senator from Oregon has just stated that we should approach resource development not on a regional or State basis, but rather, on an overall basin basis. He referred to the support which was forthcoming at the time the Hungry Horse project was authorized, and during the years when appropriations were made available to complete that fine water resource development.

At this point the Senator from Idaho would like to emphasize the desirability of continuing that spirit of cooperation. The Senator from Oregon refers to the Hungry Horse project as having been of unusual value and importance to the people of Montana. I am sure that if the Senator from Oregon were to be consistent he would agree to support the Bruces Eddy project on the north fork of the Clearwater River, which is also a very vital project, and important to the State of Idaho. It certainly fits into the same category as does the Hungry Horse project. I am sure that the junior Senator from Oregon, if he applies the formula which he has just outlined, will find himself in complete accord with the efforts to have the Bruces Eddy project authorized.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to comment on the statement of the Senator from Idaho, inasmuch as he has discussed my statement.

I will say to the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho, because he has brought up the question of the Bruces Eddy project, that Bruces Eddy is quite different from the Hells Canyon project. The Hells Canyon project is infinitely greater in scope, far greater in the flood-control storage which would be provided, and infinitely more productive in the amount of hydroelectricity which would be generated, than is the Bruces Eddy project.

In addition, the Hells Canyon project would not have an adverse effect on fisheries, wildlife, or wilderness areas that encompass and safeguard scenic grandeur. Virtually every outdoor and wildlife organization in the United States has gone on record as opposed to the Bruces Eddy project and supported the Hells Canyon project.

I myself do not understand the position of the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho. In his own State he has consistently advocated the Bruces Eddy project, and yet has opposed the far more productive, far more valuable Hells Canyon project. I may be entirely mistaken in my understanding of his position, but I do not comprehend it.

Let me conclude by adding one further observation in connection with the very able address of the senior Senator from Montana. I am pleased that he has

emphasized the full development of our great rivers, like the Snake River and the Columbia River. Today, as we stand on the floor of the Senate, our potential foes in the Soviet Union are building some of the largest river development projects ever undertaken. These projects involve the Yenesei, the Ob, the Lena, and the Volga Rivers. It is my information that there is a greater quantity of potential hydroelectric power within the borders of the Soviet Union than within the borders of the United States.

Today we are far ahead of the Soviet Union in production of energy, but they are going forward with projects which I understand, in some instances, will be even bigger than Grand Coulee, which now stands as the largest hydroelectric undertaking ever built in any country. How can we, in our country, sacrifice our rivers, which are a God-given resource, to anything less than full development, if our potential enemies in Russia are using still mightier rivers, such as the Yenesei, the Ob, the Lena, and the Volga to the utmost of their capacity in kilowatts?

It seems to me that it is folly, from the standpoint of national defense, for us not to obtain every single kilowatt lurking in rivers like the Columbia and its tributaries, when this power can be tapped without imperiling wildlife.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] for his very clear explanation of the situation. I am sure that the people of this country are aware of the importance of this problem of developing our American resources to their highest potential.

I thank the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] for his remarks. I assure him that Montana and the Senate and the Congress want to see Idaho prosper. That is why the two Senators from Montana and its Representatives are fighting for Hells Canyon. We think it will be a great benefit to Idaho.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] also expresses a belief that the reservation of power to Idaho is subordinate to the general preference clause of the Bonneville Project Act, so that Idaho could lose all its rights to this power reserved. Counsel advises me to the contrary. The statutory reservation to Idaho comes first. Within Idaho, public and cooperative distribution systems will have first call on the 500,000 kilowatts of power. But preference outside Idaho cannot defeat the express reservation of the 500,000 kilowatts for use in Idaho and other small parts of the Snake River Basin lying outside Idaho.

HOW WILL IDAHO'S INTERESTS BE BEST SERVED?

Another effort to stir dissension between Idaho and Montana is the charge that Idaho suffered great injury when the Victor Chemical Works built its new plant in Butte, Mont., instead of in Idaho.

Idaho lost this plant because it did not have the necessary low-cost power to offer Victor. Montana did. If my colleague from Utah would really like to help the people of Idaho, the logical way to do it is to help them develop their low-cost power. I invite the Senator from Utah, earnestly and sin-

cerely, to join me in helping Idaho get the real solution for its development problems by backing Hells Canyon Dam. It is the only project which can provide for Idaho the large block of low-cost power it needs for its industrial development. And it will do the job. There are industries lined up waiting for low-cost energy—aluminum and light metals, chemical and others. Low-cost power would unlock a tremendous phosphate fertilizer development in Idaho, lowering costs of this vital material to farmers from California to Ohio.

This is Idaho's great chance. Even the Federal Power Commission examiner who found against the high dam at Hells Canyon admitted that it could produce power at 2.7 mills. This is in contrast to the 7.6-mill power he found would be produced at the Brownlee project of the Idaho Power Co. What a tragedy for the people of Idaho if they are prevented from obtaining this great block of 2- to 3-mill power—half a million kilowatts of it. That is more than all the power presently used in the entire State of Idaho. It would get them a dozen plants or more equal to Victor Chemical. It would create thousands of jobs. It would swell tax collections. It would make Idaho really blossom like the rose, stimulating the economy of the whole Nation.

Instead of shedding copious crocodile tears about Idaho—and then voting to saddle her with high-cost power which no industry can afford—we are supporting 2- to 3-mill power for the citizens of Idaho.

We want our neighbor on the West to develop and grow.

We will not publicly shed crocodile tears about her fate and then vote to keep her the exploited, captive province of an eastern power company.

THE CHARGE OF SUBSIDY

A great part of the statement of my friend from Utah was devoted to a charge that big business is being subsidized by power from Hungry Horse and other projects on the Columbia Basin. He says that Anaconda Aluminum Co. is receiving half of the power from Hungry Horse at the "at-site" Bonneville rate of 1.72 mills.

This at-site rate was established to encourage some industries to locate in the immediate area of these great projects. Construction of these projects floods large blocks of land which are taken out of the tax base, and displaces many people. New property values and new opportunities are needed to offset this economic upset. The rate, therefore, is wisely designed. It is justified because transmission costs are avoided. The customer must take his power from the bus bar. There is no subsidy.

Absolutely nothing scandalous can be made of this when all the facts are revealed and considered. I am surprised that my learned colleague from Utah did not put all these facts in his statement, because I have always respected him as a very fair man.

It is regrettable when the pressure of work makes it impossible for a Senator to do the research and the careful check-

ing which should be done on every statement made on this Senate floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It ought to be brought out, also, that the power guaranteed to Montana from Hungry Horse, which amounts to approximately 200,000 kilowatts of prime power, is for use in the State of Montana, and that every REA in the Bonneville area within the State of Montana has had its power rates reduced from 8 and 9 mills a kilowatt down to the Bonneville rate of somewhere in the vicinity of 3 and 4 mills a kilowatt. It ought to be brought out also that because of Hungry Horse we did get a big aluminum plant located in the Flathead Valley of northwestern Montana, and that we also got a phosphate plant located in the region between Butte and Anaconda.

It should be remembered also that the tax base has been broadened considerably because of these projects. Furthermore, the total cost, something in the neighborhood of \$101 million, will be repaid to the Federal Government within 30 years, with interest. On the assumption that these projects have an average life of 100 years, it would be indicated that for the last 70 years practically all the revenues derived from this project would flow into the Federal Treasury.

In other words, Hungry Horse, Hells Canyon, Yellowtail, Libby, and other projects of that kind are assets to the people, to the Government, and to the economy of our country.

I believe that those who live in a part of the United States which has a potential exceeding 40 percent of the possible hydroelectric power of the country, and in the 10 western counties of Montana which have 10 percent of the entire potential—and this has been pointed out by the junior Senator from Oregon, who has advocated it time and time again—should harness these rivers and develop these sites on a multipurpose basis, so that we can irrigate and reclaim our lands, and at the same time furnish cheap electricity to the people, bring in new industries, broaden our tax base, give people jobs, and give our youngsters opportunities.

Hungry Horse is the greatest development, economically, that has ever happened in the State of Montana. Nobody has been hurt. Everyone has been benefited by it. The same comment would be applicable to Hells Canyon on the Idaho-Oregon border.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank my colleague for his very able and eloquent remarks. There is no question that everything he said can be justified by recourse to the RECORD.

THE TRUE COST OF HUNGRY HORSE POWER

The Senator from Utah quoted a letter from someone in the Interior Department to the effect that the power from Hungry Horse Dam, which Anaconda was buying for 1.72 mills, cost 3.76 mills to produce in 1955.

The 1956 annual report of the Bonneville Power Administration, which has

up-to-date figures, shows that Hungry Horse Dam power was produced at a cost of 2.84 mills per kilowatt-hour for at-site power.

The salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the at-site output, so the whole cost of Hungry Horse cannot properly be charged to at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again show that there is absolutely nothing to criticize where all facts are considered. It also demonstrates how fruitless it is to deal with a great system by considering its separate parts individually.

I am glad the point about separating costs has been raised. It demonstrates clearly the futility of considering an integrated system as merely the sum of its parts taken separately and independently.

On such a basis, we all ought to have our stomachs removed. They constitute an expense, requiring food. Our earnings come from the work of our minds, our hands, arms, and legs.

Fractionalizing the Columbia Basin is exactly what the Senator from Utah and others are now urging at Hells Canyon. Perhaps the reason for their position is a lack of understanding of the necessity of considering the whole human body, or a river basin, as a unit. If this is the cause of their error, I would urge them to study carefully the words of two great Republican Presidents of our country who understood these problems better.

It was President Theodore Roosevelt, the father of comprehensive development and conservation in this country, who said in 1908 in his message transmitting to Congress the preliminary report of the Inland Waterways Commission:

Every stream should be used to its utmost. No stream can be so used unless such use is planned in advance. When such plans are made, we shall find that, instead of interfering, one use can often be made to assist another. Each river system, from its headwaters in the forest to its mouth on the coast, is a single unit and should be treated as such.

And President William Howard Taft, in his White River veto message in 1912, said, in language which could be applied to the Hells Canyon development without changing a single word:

The lower river is being improved by a series of dams belonging to the Federal Government. This dam, situated in the upper reaches of the river, is, according to the report of the engineers, capable of becoming part of this general Federal improvement of navigation. To introduce a diversity of title into a series of dams which may all become eventually a part of a single improvement directed at the same end would, in my opinion, be highly objectionable.

These are principles which have been honored and acted upon for the last half-century, and we betray future generations when we fail to abide by them.

It is extremely difficult for me to understand why some of our modern Republicans are unable to grasp facts which Republicans in 1908 and 1912 grasped and expounded with ease.

It is even more difficult for me to understand why the Senator from Utah was unable to grasp the fallacy of separating projects in his statement about the Northwest projects when, during the upper Colorado hearings in 1955, he knew that it is the overall picture which is important.

At page 439 of the Senate hearings on the upper Colorado, held in 1955, I find the Senator from Utah told a witness, criticizing pooling of income:

It is sound economics if the overall income is sufficient to do the job.

Has the Senator let this fact slip from his mind in the 2 years since those hearings were held? There can be no other explanation.

NO SUBSIDY INVOLVED

There is no sound basis for any charge of subsidy in the Pacific Northwest power rates. Benefits they do bring—tremendous benefits both to the people and the industries involved. Hungry Horse Dam is a great project in a great system which is paying for itself while bringing tremendous benefits to the Northwest and to the whole Nation. Why should we try to besmirch such a proud picture with vague charges of subsidy which cannot withstand the true facts?

At one point in this statement, the Senator from Utah indicated that Bonneville Power Administration, overall, is charging less than cost for its power.

This is what the statement said:

The BPA could come up with an estimated cost per kilowatt-hour of only 2.5 mills for the entire system. However, in spite of these cost estimates, the Bonneville system sells the bulk of its power for \$17.50 a kilowatt-year, which averages out roughly 2.1 mills per kilowatt-hour.

That statement would have been technically correct if the Senator had added on the end of the phrase "at 100 percent load factor." Unfortunately, he did not, so it is not even technically an accurate representation of the facts. But even if the statement had been technically complete, it would have left a misleading impression in the public mind that Bonneville does not even get cost for its power.

The fact is that few customers of Bonneville Power Administration, or any other, take their power 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, which is 100 percent load factor. At Bonneville, the average load factor is 75 percent. The customers' average use is 18 hours a day—not 24 hours.

This means that for every 100 kilowatts of firm, 24-hour power Bonneville can generate, it can contract to deliver 133 kilowatts to different customers. When the load goes off in one area, or one plant, it shifts its power to another area or customer who needs it. This is the tremendous advantage of having a

large, regionwide power-grid system. It is neither dishonest nor tricky. It occurs in every major power network in the country. It explains why a \$17.50 rate per kilowatt-year for power is ample in the Bonneville situation. Because 4 kilowatts can be sold on an annual basis for every 3 of firm capacity, a 2.1-mill rate is adequate.

The Senator from Utah, I fear, has been victimized by someone who did not know the facts about power operations and ratemaking, or for some other reason gave him only part of the facts. Otherwise, I am sure that he would not have made the misleading statement that he did.

A MAGIC ECONOMIC DEVICE

Mr. President, if one were to accept as completely accurate the picture of the Columbia River Basin power system which the Senator from Utah has painted, then we have found an almost magic economic device.

Consider the picture with which his statement leaves us. Here is a great provider of energy which does these things: First, it provides its customers with power at the lowest rates in the world. Second, it pays its operating and maintenance expense. Third, it repays its original cost over 50 years with interest and then remains the property of the people of the United States—a tremendous windfall at no net expense.

During the upper Colorado hearings, at page 176 of the hearing record, Senator WARKINS recognized how these projects pay out and expressed the opinion, which I quote:

The people who have paid for them should own them.

The Columbia Basin is not asking transfer of title to these great projects. After they pay for themselves they belong to the Nation.

Fourth, at the same time—and this is according to the text of the Senator from Utah—it provides hundreds of millions of dollars in subsidies for industries. According to the Senator, Hungry Horse Dam, which will repay all its costs, will provide \$100 million subsidy for an aluminum industry that gets half of its output. The Dalles Dam, besides repaying all its \$270 million costs, will provide \$300 million subsidies for industrial customers.

As we all know, these new industries create jobs. This increases purchasing power, and stimulates more new business, more tax payments, and a healthier economy.

This is a very accurate picture, as a matter of fact, with a single exception. The benefits which power consumers receive—including the industries—are not subsidies. They are savings resulting from direct performance by Government of one of its utility responsibilities instead of turning the job over to affiliates of the Electric Bond & Share Co., headquartered in Wall Street, who exploit the West through high power rates which cover up padded operating expenses including unnecessary management fees, propaganda and lobbying charges.

Examination of the statement which the distinguished Senator from Utah

placed in the Record could continue in this same way indefinitely. I am surprised and feel very sad that my associate and colleague has apparently been victimized with so much misinformation.

I am saddened that the distinguished Senator from Utah has taken an attitude toward the Northwest which he criticized in opponents of the upper Colorado 2 years ago. When a California witness was criticizing that project, the Senator from Utah told the witness:

When we are in the game, when our turn to go to bat comes up, you want to call the game, you want to stop us now.

Today it is the Senator from Utah who wants to call the game. He has had his time at bat, so the Senator from Utah wants to stop the development of the Pacific Northwest.

The Senate of the United States is going to be deluged with growing quantities of misinformation about the Columbia Basin power system in the next few weeks.

A vote on the Hells Canyon Dam bill is approaching.

Some of us are battling to see that the Government does not throw away a half-million kilowatts of hydroelectric power capacity at Hells Canyon, by letting the Idaho Power Co. clutter the site with little, inadequate dams.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I again express my appreciation to the Senator from Montana, as I did earlier this afternoon, for the excellent analysis he is presenting in the field of the power problems in the Pacific Northwest. There are two questions I wish to raise, as to which I shall be glad to have his observations.

The Senator has just finished pointing out that the proposed Hells Canyon Dam raises the question whether or not the full power resources of the Snake River at Hells Canyon will be developed, or whether we are to go along with the underdevelopment of the power resources by the Idaho Power Co. through its low-head dam. I think that question needs to be pointed up, because the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], in Salt Lake City, last Saturday, created the impression that the Idaho Power Co. program would produce as much power as would the Hells Canyon Dam project.

Does not the Senator from Montana agree with me that it is unanswerably clear from the official reports of the examiner of the Federal Power Commission himself that the Hells Canyon Dam program, taking into account the benefits of downstream dams, would produce approximately 50 percent more power than would the Idaho Power Co.'s program?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct; I do not think there can be any question about it.

Mr. MORSE. I think that point needs to be stressed. I have discovered that when the people realize what an astounding giveaway this program of the Eisenhower administration is, in opposition to the Hells Canyon Dam, they are as shocked as I am. But the people have been fed the private utility propa-

ganda line for so long, and they have read the high-priced advertisements in the national magazines, which are paid for by the electric-power users in their electric-power rates, that it is not surprising to learn the number of persons who are of the opinion that about the same amount of power would be produced by either project. So I build up to the question again: Is it not true that the Hells Canyon Dam project, considering the downstream benefits, would produce, in round numbers, about 50 percent more power than the Idaho Power Co.'s program would produce?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is absolutely correct; there can be no question about it. I do not think that fact can be disputed by anyone who wants to be guided by the record.

Mr. MORSE. One other point. The Senator earlier in his speech spoke about the claims which are being made by some persons that the Hells Canyon Dam project will discriminate against the State of Idaho. The Senator well knows that in speech after speech over the years, as I have spoken on this subject, I have brought out, time and time again, the benefits from Hells Canyon Dam which will accrue to the people of Idaho themselves. I am pleased to note that increasing numbers of people in the State of Idaho—and I am happy to say this when the new Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is occupying the chair of the Presiding Officer—are beginning to see the soundness of the position taken by the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Oregon and others who have been joining with us in this fight, over the years, for Hells Canyon Dam.

But I want the Senator from Montana to comment on this one point, because we find it in the speeches of the Senator from Utah and in the propaganda of the private utilities, namely, that the Hells Canyon Dam will in some way, somehow, injure the farmers of the State of Idaho, in that it will take away their water rights. The Senator from Montana has been the chairman of the committee and has heard the testimony. He has heard the Senator from Oregon speak on the subject. He knows that I have insisted upon placing in the bill language which will make it perfectly clear that the people of Idaho who have existing water rights, or who may in the future legitimately acquire such rights, will not have their water rights affected one iota by the building of Hells Canyon Dam, but their priority water rights, whether existing now or acquired in the future, will be continued in effect by the Hells Canyon Dam. The Hells Canyon bill could not be clearer or more explicit on this point than it is. I would be the first to insist upon it. Does the Senator from Montana agree with me about that?

Mr. MURRAY. I absolutely agree. I do not think there can be any question about the correctness of the observation the Senator from Oregon has made.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Montana also agree that my insistence that the bill provide for the reservation of 500,000 kilowatts for the use of the people of that area, which includes some eastern counties of Oregon, as well as all

the counties in Idaho, is rather clear proof of our honest intention to see to it that the people of Idaho and of eastern Oregon are not discriminated against as the result of the building of the dam, but, to the contrary, that they will be greatly benefited by the reservation of this tremendously large block of power, amounting to 500,000 kilowatts—more than is presently used in the entire State of Idaho?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct. I do not think anyone can question that; I do not think there can be any argument about it, when the actual facts are considered.

Mr. MORSE. The able Senator from Montana has already presented the matter very well, but I thought it might be well for me to submit these additional points. I thank the Senator from Montana very much for permitting me to make the numerous interruptions I have made in the course of his speech.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have been glad to yield, because I think the Senator from Oregon has contributed to the understanding of the people regarding this matter.

Mr. President, some of us are battling to get Idaho the low-cost power supply she needs and deserves.

The road runners for the power companies will be delivering misinformation by the truckloads—just as they do in their deceitful advertising programs—in an effort to block Hells Canyon Dam. They will dress it up in all kinds of plausible garb and will try to foist it off on busy Senators. We must be on guard.

The fact is that, if Hells Canyon Dam is not built, we shall have wasted for all time a half million kilowatts of low-cost energy. We shall have committed a criminal act—the waste of resources which belong to the people of the United States, whom we represent. We are their trustees. Congress alone can prevent the proposed waste of resources. The Secretary of the Interior has come too late with his half hearted plan for a high Pleasant Valley Dam. We shall betray our trust if we in Congress permit the administration to throw away such an enormous public asset.

Over and above a betrayal of our trust over physical resources of the people of the United States, we would betray democracy itself.

The charge is made by our enemies abroad that powerful private interests control our supposedly democratic government; that it is not in reality democratic. The proposed waste of resources at Hells Canyon has been cited as an example and a measure of the power of these vested interests over our Government.

In the approaching Hells Canyon vote we shall have an opportunity to disprove that charge. We shall have an opportunity to show the world that multi-million-dollar advertising campaigns, distortion of truth, half truths, and all the other tricks in the Power Trust arsenal were unable in the final showdown to cause the people's representatives in the Senate to betray the people's interest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield further to me, let me say that on last Saturday I made a speech at Salt Lake City, as I stated earlier this afternoon, before the Western States Water and Power Conference. My subject on that occasion was Natural Resources: God's Gifts Are Man's Challenge.

It so happened that the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] also spoke at the conference, although I did not know what his subject matter was to be. But it so happens that parts of the speech I made are themselves an answer to the position taken by the Senator from Utah.

Therefore I wonder whether the Senator from Montana will be willing to grant the courtesy of permitting me to ask unanimous consent to have my speech inserted in the RECORD immediately following his speech, without my taking the time to read it this afternoon in the Senate.

Mr. MURRAY. I shall be very glad to have that done.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address I made at Salt Lake City on May 11 may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATURAL RESOURCES: GOD'S GIFTS ARE MAN'S CHALLENGE

(Address by Hon. WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, Western States Water and Power Conference, Salt Lake City, May 11, 1957)

At the very outset I wish to commend the groups that have joined together for this conference. It is a great pleasure to join with you in paying tribute and expressing our western appreciation to Congressman MIKE KIRWAN. He has been a great benefactor of the Western States in the field of natural resource development. In fact, he has a better and wider understanding of the natural resource programs of Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot—two great liberal Republicans—than do some of our western Republicans now sitting in the Congress.

Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot taught the great truth that each generation is but the trustee of God's gifts of natural resources to the people of our country.

The Eisenhower administration has betrayed that ideal time and time again. It must be held to an accounting for its wasteful program of underdevelopment of our river basins.

The American people must recognize before it is too late that water is our most precious natural resource. Civilizations go down as water tables go down. The water table of America has started to go down. We can stop it only by adopting a sound water conservation program. Full development of our river basins, not underdevelopment, is essential if we are to protect the economic and moral rights of future generations of Americans boys and girls in their rightful heritage to the maximum water potential of America. It is time for the American people to demand of their Government that it place the welfare of our boys and girls of the future ahead of the selfish privateering interests of monopolies, such as the Idaho Power Co. and the Utah Power & Light Co. and other private utility monopolies, which would place their profit interest above the public interest.

Water supplies and power are the indispensable elements for the development of both industry and agriculture in our even more complex society. Nowhere are they needed more urgently than in the West and nowhere is their development more difficult.

During Easter week of 1955, I flew over most of the Western States with the Senate Interior Committee. I sat with the committee during its hearings on Hells Canyon in Idaho, Washington, and Oregon. We went by plane to California to view the great Central Valley project and then up the Colorado Basin, stopping in Salt Lake City.

On that trip I resolved all of my doubts about the upper Colorado project. No one could see what I saw on that trip and fail to recognize the desperate need for the water storage that the upper Colorado project alone could make available for the expanding communities of the basin. States, cities, and towns, industry and agriculture would stagnate without the harnessing of the scarce water supplies of the Colorado and its tributaries.

It is a fact of western life that in all but a few communities the availability of water is the indispensable condition of progress. In most parts of the West water is scarce. In the Columbia Basin water is plentiful. Throughout the area we are blessed with great mineral, forest, and land resources. They depend upon water and power to make them useful.

Water is where you find it. In this century we have learned from the great conservationists like Pinchot that water cannot only be conserved with wisdom and will, but man can increase water supply by watershed development. Water conservation and forestry go together—each assists the other. Beyond that, water flow can be regulated and channeled so that it can be taken from where it is to where it is needed and the tyranny of the seasons—of alternate flood and drought can be controlled and moderated.

Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt learned and taught a great lesson: That the development and use of God-given natural resources must be undertaken on a basinwide scale.

The upper Colorado project is expensive. Those of you who battled it through to success will remember the propaganda against it. Cost was the chief problem. The Council of State Chambers of Commerce made up an impressive chart of how much money the project would supposedly cost every State in the country. The chart and chambers failed to say how much the Nation would benefit from more economic farming, expanding industry, and commerce in the basin States which will benefit our whole national economy.

Hundreds of letters came to me from Oregon, and many from elsewhere, demanding to know how this expense to taxpayers in non-basin States could be justified. There was no political profit in it for me, I assure you, to reply as I did that sound resource development in any area, assistance in developing it to its maximum potential, was a sound investment in a stronger America.

And it will be remembered that the conservation groups throughout the country launched what was possibly their greatest campaign against the building of Echo Park Dam. Their arguments were appealing; their sincerity indisputable. There was another side to the story. Several Senators from this area presented the case for Echo Park. That great chairman of the Senate Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, Democrat, was one. Senator ARTHUR WATKINS, of Utah, a Republican, was another. I listened to them as I listened to the opponents. I remembered ARTHUR WATKINS sent me a copy of a speech he made. It was a long speech—and coming from me, that means it was a very long speech indeed.

I read it; I studied it. I was convinced by it, though it came from a member of the opposite party on behalf of a project supported by the same administration that fought projects so vital to my region.

So I supported the overall project and supported Echo Park Dam as well. In doing so, I ran great political risks a year before my own reelection campaign, the hottest my State has ever seen.

I do not recount any of this to seek credit. Other Senators and Representatives did as much and more. What, for example, what benefit could the Democratic leader of the House, JOHN MCCORMACK, expect from his action in support of upper Colorado? His constituents in Massachusetts had no great regard for the project; conservation groups were against it; his own State and region were suffering and still suffer from grave unemployment problems and all their attendant distress. To JOHN MCCORMACK's great credit, he opened the debate in the House and made a plea for nonpartisan action to authorize the upper Colorado project in order to build a better West and a stronger Nation. To his great credit, he did this in the face of great discontent among Democrats caused by the Republican administration's opposition to Hells Canyon and TVA, which the Democrats look upon as presenting the same issues. Indeed, they are less costly and produce greater benefits.

With bipartisan unity, the upper Colorado authorization prevailed. This is the way of progress for the West. Democrats and Republicans joined together in a common purpose to build the water storage projects and power so desperately needed in Utah and its neighboring States.

We do not ask for gratitude. Those who joined the basin State Representatives in Congress did only what we believed was right, and for this we deserve no thanks.

All that we ask is equal treatment—a fair hearing on the merits. All Americans have a stake in preventing the devastation of New England floods, the destruction and suffering of the drought in the Great Plains. All Americans have a stake in water and power development in California at Trinity and throughout the Central Valley project. We all have a stake in bringing desperately needed water to a vast portion of Colorado through the Frypan-Arkansas project.

We will need the food from newly irrigated acres in a decade or so. We have an interest in helping farmers, workers, and businessmen lead productive lives—as fellow Americans, as producers of new wealth in which we all can share, as consumers of the products the rest of us produce.

In achieving this development, the Nation has a right to expect that the benefits of these national projects will be widely shared. People in the East and South have a right to expect that water for irrigation will not be monopolized by a few large landholders, but will help preserve and build family farms which are so vital to the continuation of our social and political tradition.

That is what is involved in strict adherence to the excess lands provision, the antimonopoly policy, embedded in the reclamation acts since 1903.

It is not fair to expect the Government of all the people to use the people's substance to benefit a few, to aid monopoly, which is the natural economic and political enemy of democracy.

That is why a handful of us have fought against the whittling away of the 160-acre limitation in Federal reclamation project legislation. That is why we are fighting to put back the 160-acre limitation in the \$100 million Small Projects Act. I warn that if only a few are permitted to benefit, the public at large will rebel against having their funds used for reclamation.

WHAT IS GOOD FOR THE UPPER COLORADO IS GOOD FOR THE COLUMBIA BASIN

And we ask, if \$800 million can be authorized for the upper Colorado project, why should far less be denied for a superlative project like high Hells Canyon Dam, which is a more economic project?

Why do so many of the upper Colorado partisans who received such a sympathetic hearing turn a deaf ear to those who helped them, when the same principles are involved?

If Federal dams are good for Utah, Colorado, and Arizona, why are they socialism—creeping, galloping, or static—in Idaho, Oregon, and Washington?

Why is Glen Canyon a symbol of sound progress and Hells Canyon to be shunned as unworthy?

Surely the answer cannot be that Hells Canyon would store more water, or has more flood control, or more power and cheaper power.

Part of the answer is to be found in the fact that the upper Colorado project was not attractive to private utilities. Utah, for example, has no rural electric co-ops. Most of the publicly generated power will go to Utah Power & Light, which apparently will not thus be tainted by socialistic kilowatts. In contrast, Hells Canyon would be in the heart of the Idaho Power Co. monopoly area, fringed by rural electric co-ops, where public body competition is a factor. Further, the Hells Canyon site is so good that the power company wanted it for itself.

But it has not wanted it badly enough to consider full development. It is an incontrovertible fact that the Idaho Power Co. scheme will not develop the full power or flood-control potential of the magnificent Hells Canyon area. But the Federal high dam would and, in addition, contribute to power output at many other dams downstream.

Is it moral to waste the best remaining dam site in the United States with such underdevelopment when full flood control is so desperately needed, when a power shortage lies immediately ahead? Can it be said that the resources which God's bounty has made possible is man's to waste?

The thundering answer of the people of the Northwest has been "No." They have shown as clearly as possible that they want full development as part of a basinwide, comprehensive program. They want and deserve only what has been authorized for the Upper Colorado Basin.

But Hells Canyon is controversial, it is said. The simple answer is: So was upper Colorado. Indeed the same State chamber of commerce argument has been leveled at both; the same misleading propaganda has besmirched both. Why is it more true for one than the other?

But, Hells Canyon is political, it is said. Who made it so. Most Democrats refused to make upper Colorado political, when it would have been so easy and profitable to take the easy course of opposition. Who has made Hells Canyon political?—the very Republicans who were staunchest for upper Colorado.

I may say there are fewer of them in Congress today. These political victories are not an end in themselves. In our democratic system, they must be honored as the registered will of the voters of a great region—a region with desperate problems of periodically too much water and too little energy, much land and too little irrigation, a great river system and too little navigation control.

HELLS CANYON THE SYMBOL

In a few weeks, the United States Senate will vote on Hells Canyon. That vote probably will be the last chance there is to save this dam site for full development in the public interest. Upon that full development depends the future integrity of the Colum-

bia Basin plan so painstakingly blueprinted by the Bureau of Reclamation and Army Corps of Engineers.

Upon that note will depend the future of irrigation in Idaho and eastern Oregon—and much more, the principle that power revenues be devoted in part to the reclamation of arid land.

So long as Hells Canyon has remained alive it has been the symbol of a people's determination to resist underdevelopment for quick profit and the perpetration of monopoly. If that symbol is destroyed, the forces of profit plunder will know no bounds.

The loss of Hells Canyon to profit plunder will be a blow not only to my region, but at every place where the same issue exists or comes into controversy. The issue is: Will a national resource be surrendered to underdevelopment for the profit of a few or be developed fully for the greatest good for the greatest number in the long run?

THE NATIONAL STAKE

The Columbia Basin contains 60 percent of the Nation's potential hydroelectric power—the least expensive power possible in the foreseeable future. Water is the only renewable energy source. Others, like oil and gas, are presently plentiful but expanding use threatens depletion while new discoveries are not keeping pace. It seems prudent to husband scarce and more expensive fuel and develop the fuel supply—waterpower—that is inexhaustible if conservation principles are followed. But this is not being done today.

To the contrary, the present administration gave away its conservation control over vast offshore oil reserves and at the very same time aided and encouraged underdevelopment of water storage and power output at Hells Canyon. It has encouraged the same kind of private underdevelopment at the site at Paradise where private exploitation would result in an infinitesimal fraction of potential power development. The administration has stalled the Yellow Tail Dam project and delayed Libby Dam, considering even its deauthorization. It has failed to press for some arrangement with Canada to harness the prodigious power and flood-control potential of the upper Columbia Basin—possibly because downstream benefits would be bestowed on public power projects.

This administration has been pious, but powerless. It has tried to twist and turn in every conceivable fashion to avoid building John Day Dam as a Federal project, despite its authorization in 1950 and the crying need for its power.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND POWER

All this has been done in the name of protecting private enterprise. The trouble is that this administration doesn't seem to know the difference between the tollgate keeper and the vehicles of industry and commerce.

High-cost private power benefits only a handful of stockholders—the biggest of them financial houses in the East. High-cost power prevents industrial and commercial growth, which is so badly needed in the West, and especially my region. Every winter Idaho and Oregon have the highest rates of unemployment in the Nation because our principal sources of income—agriculture, timber, and mining—are seasonal. Low-cost power can change that to the benefit of the whole Nation.

One example will suffice. Southern Idaho and northern Utah contain the largest undeveloped phosphate beds in the country. With low-cost power an entire industry can be born in that area for the production of phosphate fertilizer. It would be a boon to farmers as far east as Ohio who would receive fertilizer, now scarce, at savings of \$8 to \$20 a ton. Farmers desperately need reduction of operating costs and lower unit

costs. Hells Canyon would make that possible.

And Idaho and Utah would have a new profit producing, job making industry. Without Hells Canyon a far more expensive, less extensive operation will be forced upon the farm co-ops which have had such promising plans.

Without Hells Canyon, full Columbia Basin development will not be possible—either for industry or agriculture. Vast new purchasing power will not be created and potential markets for the products of factories and mills throughout the country will be lost.

Economic development and defense strength will be sacrificed—all in the name of protecting the Idaho Power tollgate keeper.

PAYING THE DESPOILER

The administration and private utility propaganda has hammered away at the theme that the low, wasteful dams would save the taxpayers' money and be built without expense to the Treasury.

You have all seen the slick magazine ads costing thousands of dollars dinnings that theme into the unsuspecting public. Administration apologists have hammered away at it too.

Yet, as many of us predicted, the taxpayers would end up paying for a large part of the pygmy dams. Last month the Office of Defense Mobilization announced the granting of too quick tax writeoff certificates for \$65 million of the cost—at least.

That means millions of dollars of lost tax revenues for the Federal Treasury during the first 5 years of the projects. In turn, the rest of the country's taxpayers have to shoulder that burden. Literally billions of dollars of certificates have been granted the utilities in the past few years. At the same time the administration opposed \$20 individual tax cuts. Further, the administration opposed any new dam starts outside the upper Colorado project as being beyond the Nation's financial capability, despite the fact that multipurpose dams pay for themselves with interest.

The hypocrisy of this administration's program staggers the imagination. It is so crass, that many have not been able to believe it. But, the facts are too clear, the evidence too conclusive. The crusade has been a vast glittering generality distracting the public while their pockets are picked. And the people are getting wise to it.

I urge each of you to go to your home communities and spread the alarm before it is too late. The West is being plundered. The public's resources handed over to monopoly.

There is an historic battle being waged for a principle—that the people's resources are to be dedicated and developed for the people's use. The battle has been going on for many years. It is reaching a climax at Hells Canyon.

Let us here resolve that the giveaways shall not be suffered to go on. Draw the line at Hells Canyon.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

STUDY OF CRITICAL RAW MATERIALS AND RESOURCES OF THE SOVIET UNION

During the delivery of Mr. MURRAY's speech,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 78) to make a study of critical

raw materials and resources of the Soviet Union and certain Eastern Hemisphere countries and the effect upon the United States.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 290, Senate bill 999, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the State of North Dakota for the use and benefit of the North Dakota State School of Science.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 999) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the State of North Dakota for the use and benefit of the North Dakota State School of Science, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 9, after the word "thereon", to strike out "The southwest quarter of the northwest quarter; the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter; and the west 19 rods of the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 5, township 132 north, range 47 west, fifth principal meridian, comprising 80.0637 acres more or less" and insert "The southwest quarter of the northwest quarter, lot 3 and the west 19 rods of lot 2 of section 5 in township 132 north of range 47 west of the fifth principal meridian; the said description also being known as the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter and the west 19 rods of the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 5 in township 132 north of range 47 west of the fifth principal meridian, containing 80.0637 acres more or less according to the United States Government survey thereof after allowing a deduction of 5.61 acres now occupied by the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. as a right-of-way, formerly known as the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., being that portion of said land conveyed to the Fargo Southern Railroad Co. in a certain warranty deed recorded in book J of deeds on page 171 in the office of the register of deeds of Richland County, N. Dak.: *Provided*, That title to the land described in this section shall revert to the United States if, at any time within 25 years after conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior, the land is used for other than educational purposes.", and, on page 3, after line 15, to insert:

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall reserve to the United States all mineral interests in land conveyed under this act, and the right to mine and remove the same under applicable laws and regulations to be established by him.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of North Dakota, for the use and benefit of the North Dakota State School of Science, all right, title, and interest of the United States to the following described land, located in

Richland County, N. Dak., together with any buildings or other improvements thereon: The southwest quarter of the northwest quarter, lot 3 and the west 19 rods of lot 2 of section 5 in township 132 north of range 47 west of the fifth principal meridian; the said description also being known as the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter and the west 19 rods of the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 5 in township 132 north of range 47 west of the fifth principal meridian, containing 80.0637 acres more or less according to the United States Government survey thereof after allowing a deduction of 5.61 acres now occupied by the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Co. as a right-of-way, formerly known as the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Co., being that portion of said land conveyed to the Fargo Southern Railroad Co. in a certain warranty deed recorded in book J of deeds on page 171 in the office of the register of deeds of Richland County, N. Dak.: *Provided*, That title to the land described in this section shall revert to the United States if, at any time within 25 years after conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior, the land is used for other than educational purposes.

SEC. 2. (a) As consideration for the transfer of the property referred to in the first section of this act, the North Dakota State School of Science shall make available for each of its school years, for a period of 10 school years, free tuition to 10 qualified Indians who wish to attend such school during such school year.

(b) To qualify for free tuition under this act any such prospective student shall (1) be 17 years of age or over, (2) be a high-school graduate, (3) be recommended by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and (4) meet the entrance standards of the North Dakota State School of Science.

(c) The period of 10 school years during which free tuition shall be made available under this act shall commence not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall reserve to the United States all mineral interests in land conveyed under this act, and the right to mine and remove the same under applicable laws and regulations to be established by him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to secure the floor, to discuss another matter. However, I am glad to have the Senate consider Senate bill 999 at this time, for I believe there is no objection to it.

Mr. YOUNG. That is also my position, Mr. President. I do not believe consideration of the bill will require more than 3 or 4 minutes, at the most.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask some questions about the bill, for purposes of future reference, so there will be no question as to whether I permitted the bill to be passed without raising an objection on the basis of the Morse formula, if it should appear that the bill would violate the Morse formula.

Therefore, will the Senator from North Dakota be willing to answer several questions which I wish to ask?

Mr. YOUNG. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. MORSE. First of all, let me ask what the approximate value of the property is.

Mr. YOUNG. The Indian Bureau sold some land very close to this land a year ago for \$150 an acre and that land was better suited for the purposes of the ex-

pansion of the city than is this land. For some strange reason the Indian Bureau placed a value of \$250 an acre on the particular piece of land covered by the pending bill, whereas the Indian Bureau sold the other land on a very favorable long-term contract, only a year ago, for only \$150 an acre.

Mr. MORSE. The RECORD should show that the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Oregon have discussed this matter and that the Senator from North Dakota has pointed out to the Senator from Oregon that probably the value of the land covered by the pending bill is somewhere between \$15,000 and \$20,000, but in no event more than \$20,000.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. In view of the sale, last year, for \$150 an acre, of better land which is adjacent to the land covered by the pending bill, is it accurate to state that the correct estimate of the total value of the land covered by the pending bill probably is approximately \$15,000?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that the bill provides for 10 annual tuitions for the benefit of Indian children, to enable them to go to the school which will be located on the land involved?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct; and over a period of 10 years, they will have a total value of approximately \$10,000.

Mr. MORSE. So the Senator from North Dakota assures the Senate, does he not, that, in effect, the Federal Government has adequately protected the Federal interest in this matter, insofar as the Indians are concerned, and that the Federal Government will be getting a return for the land of approximately \$10,000, which will be at least 50 percent of its appraised fair market value, and possibly more; and that therefore the Morse formula is fully complied with?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct; the bill fully complies with the Morse formula. Furthermore, it will make possible the expansion of the Washington School of Science which will benefit Indian children who are badly in need of education.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, I have no objection to the bill. I desire to thank the Senator from North Dakota for taking it up with me. I wish to state that his record has been one of supporting the Morse formula ever since I have applied it from time to time, beginning in 1946. I know I can always count on the Senator from North Dakota to join me in seeing to it that the Morse formula is complied with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar

No. 309, H. R. 6700, making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

SHALE OIL IN A NEW AGE OF ENERGY

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to state that I intend to hear as much of the speech the Senator from Wyoming will make this afternoon as time will permit.

At this time I desire to state what I said about the Senator from Wyoming when I was at Chicago, about a week ago, namely, that I think the most important investigatory work being done by the Congress at this session is that being done by the Senator from Wyoming in connection with the investigation of the oil situation. The Senator from Wyoming is being ably assisted by his colleagues on the committee, particularly by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

I hope the warning the Senator from Wyoming and his colleagues are giving the American people will be heeded, because the oil situation the Senator from Wyoming and his colleagues are investigating is, in my opinion, one of the most shocking matters in our entire body politic. I say that because time and time again we find—as the Senator from Wyoming has already pointed out in his preliminary reports on this matter—that it involves a problem which needs early attention by the Congress. As one Member of the Senate, I desire to thank the Senator from Wyoming for the fine leadership he is giving us in connection with this matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon for the undeserved compliment he has just paid me.

In connection with this matter, I have developed some facts which I wish to lay before the Senate this afternoon, so they will appear in the RECORD which will be available in the morning.

Mr. President, it is now 10 minutes after 3. The business of the Senate for the day has been completed. Several of the committees of the Senate, I am advised—and certainly it is true of the Appropriations Committee—are busily at work on measures which will be presented to the Senate later on. I do not want those who are occupying the galleries to believe that because the Chamber is almost empty the Members of the Senate are not at work. They are at work in the committee rooms and in their own offices, where they have to deal, day by day, with the problems which are presented to them by mail from their own constituencies, and from all over the United States, and

presented also by the personal visits of those who are interested in proposed legislation that comes before the Congress.

Mr. President, I wish to talk to the Senate for the purpose of making a record on the question of the importance of developing the mineral resources of the United States, and particularly those resources which are concerned with the manufacture of liquid fuel.

As the Senator from Oregon has stated, I have presided over a study of the problem of oil, particularly as it was raised by the shutting of the Suez Canal.

I have had brought into the Chamber a chart, made up of a map taken from the recent issue of the monthly magazine of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, known as the Lamp. This magazine was issued in recognition of the 75th anniversary of Standard Oil of New Jersey.

JERSEY'S WORLDWIDE OPERATIONS

I want Members of the Senate to note that I have taken from this issue a map prepared by Standard Oil of New Jersey to show its worldwide operations. The top map represents Jersey Standard in the Eastern Hemisphere. On the map are symbols representing the refineries which Standard Oil of New Jersey owns in Britain; in France; in The Netherlands; in Norway; in Sweden; in Italy; at Trieste; at Tripoli; down through the Middle East; in Saudi Arabia; a refinery at Bombay, India; at Palembang, in Sumatra; two in Australia; and two in Japan.

All over the lower portion of this map of the Eastern Hemisphere are shown symbols of wells from which Standard Oil of New Jersey produces some of its crude oil.

There are shown also the symbols of the engineers who are surveying the Sahara Desert, who are surveying Sicily, who are surveying in the southeast area of Europe, who are surveying in India—all parts of India, east and west—who are surveying throughout the Dutch East Indies, who are surveying in Australia, and who are surveying in New Guinea.

The operations are illustrated by the appearance on the map of a list of the principal operating interests of Standard Oil of New Jersey in the Eastern Hemisphere. One, the Arabian-American Oil Co., the famous Aramco, which we know as a result of the evidence presented at our hearing, pays a huge sum in taxes to Saudi Arabia, and not a nickel to the United States, on its profits from its foreign operations, because it receives credit by way of depletion allowance for the production of petroleum abroad, and credit on its tax bill in the United States by reason of whatever taxes are paid to Saudi Arabia.

Then there is the A/S Norske Esso; Dansk Esso A/S; Esso A. G.; Esso Afrique Occidentale S. A. F.; Esso-Nederland N. V.; Esso Petroleum Co., Ltd.; Esso Standard Algerie S. A.; Esso Standard (Austria); Esso Standard (Belgium) S. A.; Esso Standard Espanola, and so forth.

Mr. President, I shall not read the list now. I ask unanimous consent that the entire list be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINCIPAL OPERATING INTERESTS—EASTERN HEMISPHERE

1. Arabian-American Oil Co.¹
2. A/S Norske Esso.
3. Dansk Esso A/S.²
4. Esso A. G.
5. Esso Afrique Occidentale S. A. F.
6. Esso Nederland N. V.²
7. Esso Petroleum Co., Ltd.²
8. Esso Standard Algerie S. A.
9. Esso Standard (Austria).
10. Esso Standard (Belgium) S. A.²
11. Esso Standard Espanola, S. A.
12. Esso Standard Italiana—S. p. A.
13. Esso Standard (Libya), Inc.
14. Esso Standard (Luxembourg) S. A.
15. Esso Standard (Malta), Ltd.
16. Esso Standard Maroc S. A.
17. Esso Standard (Near East), Inc.
18. Esso Standard Portugal, Inc.
19. Esso Standard Refinery.
20. Esso Standard S. A. F.²
21. Esso Standard (Sicily), Inc.²
22. Esso Standard (Switzerland).
23. Esso Standard Tunisie S. A.
24. Esso Standard (Turkey), Inc.
25. Esso Tankschiff Reederei G. m. b. H.
26. Esso Transportation Co., Ltd.
27. Esso West Africa, Inc.
28. Gewerkschaft Brigitta.¹
29. Iranian Oil Participants, Ltd.¹
30. Iraq Petroleum Co., Ltd.^{1, 2}
31. La Columbia Soc. Marittima per Azioni.
32. N. V. Nederlandse Aardolie Mij.¹
33. oy Esso AB.
34. Standard-Vacuum Oil Co.^{1, 2}
35. Stanic-Industria Petrolifera-S. p. A.¹
36. Svenska Esso A/B.
37. Trans-Arabian Pipe Line Co.¹

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I want those who are present and who hear my voice to know that Mr. Rathbone, the president of Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, testifying before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Judiciary Committee, said that Esso has about 250 corporations.

I asked him how many of these were "paper corporations," by that meaning corporations which were defined by charter but which were not actually engaged in business. He answered, "About 75." The meaning of the answer is plain.

This procedure is not at all untypical. Standard Oil of New Jersey is ready, with charters issued by governments, to take advantage of any opportunity that may present itself throughout the world.

CORPORATE CHARTERS

We are so used to talking about corporations and corporate charters that we do not stop to think what a charter is. A corporation cannot exist without the action of some government. The constitution of the State of Wyoming says, in simple words, "A corporation is the creature of the State and is subject at all times to the regulation of the State."

That is true with respect to the Federal Government also. When the Constitution of the United States was drafted, Mr. President, the gentlemen who were members of the Constitutional Convention were thinking of only one thing, the establishment of a government of the people. They said so in the preamble, when they declared the purposes of the

¹ Jersey interest 50 percent or less.

² And associated companies.

document they were framing. With respect to interstate and foreign commerce they declared simply, in article I, section 8, of the Constitution:

The Congress shall have the power * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

The power to regulate corporations, which are the instruments by which foreign and domestic commerce is carried on, was lodged by the drafters of the Constitution in the Congress of the United States.

When the Constitution was drafted there were only three industrial corporations in the United States. There were a few banking corporations, in addition. Most of the business in those days was carried on by people in their individual capacities, or in partnerships, associations, or joint ventures, in which the entire property of the individual involved would be liable to support every debt made by the partnership or by the individual. The basic idea of the corporation was to relieve the persons who entered into business in the corporate form of personal liability for what the corporation did.

That is why in Britain the small letters "ltd." always follow after the name of a particular corporation. If the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey were a British corporation it would have a name reading "The Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, Limited," meaning "limited liability."

We have now come to a time when the States, from which the jurisdiction to regulate commerce among the States was withdrawn, are empowered to create corporations by the granting of charters which corporations are the instruments that carry on the commerce.

LIMITING CONGRESSIONAL POWER

The list of corporations of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, printed on the map which is exhibited to the Senate, shows that many of the subsidiary corporations of this gigantic organization, the second wealthiest American corporation, second only to General Motors, have corporate charters issued by foreign governments. Does it not stand to reason that Congress cannot properly regulate foreign commerce when it exercises no authority over the power, the duties, and the responsibilities of the corporations which carry on such commerce?

A simple illustration is this: The Constitution provides that no State may enter into any compact with any other State or with any foreign government without the consent of the Congress. Is it possible that a State which is forbidden by the Constitution to enter into a compact with another country can create a corporation which can do that which the creator of the corporation is forbidden to do? That is what happens.

Here is the story. All through the Arabian peninsula, all through the Middle Eastern oil area we are talking about, there are apparent the results of negotiations, in the form of agreements between American oil corporations—some of them created by the States of the

United States, and others created by foreign countries—and foreign countries. There are agreements with the King of Saudi Arabia, and agreements with one of the British petroleum companies, in which the British Government is a partner. There are agreements with the Dutch companies and the French companies.

Here we have the story of a corporation, created by a state which has no power to regulate commerce in the public interest, doing that which the creator of the corporation is prohibited from doing.

We are inclined to listen to the explanation of those who defend the corporation by saying, "Well, is it not wonderful that an American corporation can go abroad, make so much money, and bring profits back to the people of the United States?"

In one sense it is, if money is what we are after. But was the making of money the objective of those who drafted the Constitution of the United States? Not at all. Their objective was to establish a government which would make it possible for people to attend to their own business without being supervised by government or by aggregations of great wealth. They wanted individual persons to be free. Today, individual persons are not economically free, and many domestic corporations engaged in the oil business in the United States are not free, because they are afraid of the huge economic power of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey and other great oil companies, which are in the market for the oil which is produced.

JERSEY'S TANKERS

Let me give the Senate a much more interesting picture, drawn from this exhibit of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey. In the lower part of each map—one showing the Eastern Hemisphere and one showing the Western Hemisphere—there are symbols to indicate the number of tankers the company owns. Each symbol represents a tanker in existence or a tanker which is being developed.

The Standard Oil Company of New Jersey tells us it has 28 tankers already built and sailing under the British flag.

Eighteen tankers are now being built under the British flag.

Under the German flag 6 are already built and 10 are being built.

Under the French flag 7 are already built and 14 are being built.

Under the Danish flag 3 are already built and 2 are being built.

So it goes, all through the list. The total number of tankers under the British flag is 18, in addition to those which I have already cited.

Under the United States flag 38 have already been built, and 9 are being built. Under the Panamanian flag 33 tankers have already been built, and 16 are being built.

An interesting thing about the building and operation of these tankers which ply the ocean and carry on the commerce of the United States on the oceans of the world is that, under United States law, the people of the United States pay for the construction of the tankers. I

understand from the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], that an application is now pending before the Maritime Commission and the Department of Commerce for a subsidy to build huge tankers to be added to the fleet of vessels engaged in oceanborne oil commerce conducted by American companies. The application for the subsidy asks that the operators be permitted to build the new tankers with subsidies paid by the Government of the United States, while at the same time they are given the right to sell their old tankers to operators under foreign flags.

I invite attention to the map showing the operations of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey in the Western Hemisphere. I shall not take the time to describe it in detail, but it will be observed that Standard Oil of New Jersey operates not only in continental United States, but in Canada. It operates in the gulf. It operates in Cuba, and in South America. It operates 11 refineries in South America.

I have before me a list of 28 principal operating interests of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey in the Western Hemisphere. I ask unanimous consent that the list of names of the corporations be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINCIPAL OPERATING INTERESTS—WESTERN HEMISPHERE

1. The Carter Oil Co.
2. Creole Petroleum Corp.¹
3. Esso Mexicana, S. A. de C. V.
4. Esso S. A. Petrolera Argentina.
5. Esso Shipping Co.
6. Esso Standard do Brasil Inc.
7. Esso Standard (Guatemala) Inc.
8. Esso Standard (Inter-America).
9. Esso Standard Oil Co.¹
10. Esso Standard Oil Co. (Chile) S. A. C.
11. Esso Standard Oil Co. (Uruguay) S. A.
12. Esso Standard Oil, S. A.
13. Ethyl Corp.²
14. Gilbert & Barker Mfg. Co.¹
15. Humble Oil & Refining Co.¹
16. Imperial Oil Ltd.¹
17. International Petroleum Co., Ltd.¹
18. Interprovincial Pipe Line Co.—Jersey investment by Imperial Oil.^{1,2}
19. Interstate Oil Pipe Line Co.
20. Lago Oil & Transport Co., Ltd.
21. Oklahoma Oil Co.
22. Panama Transport Co.
23. Pate Oil Co.
24. Perfect Power Corp.
25. Plantation Pipe Line Co.²
26. Standard-Vacuum Oil Co.^{1,2}
27. Trans Mountain Oil Pipe Line Co.—Jersey investment by Imperial Oil.¹
28. Yellowstone Pipe Line Co.—Jersey investment by Interstate Pipe Line.²

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The map which I have been exhibiting illustrates very clearly how correct I was when, at the beginning of the hearings on the oil lift, I said that the problem was just as close to every family in the United States as the nearest filling station; and, more important than that, as near as the nearest draft board.

¹ And associated companies.

² Jersey interest 50 percent or less.

OIL, NOT FREEDOM

A glance at this map will show that our concern in the Middle East is oil, rather than freedom. We talk of freedom, but I venture to say that no one would be talking about sending our Sixth Fleet to the eastern area of the Mediterranean Sea, or talking about drafting our soldiers for military activity, if it were not for the fear that unless we did so this oil area would fall into the hands of our potential enemy, Soviet Russia.

I say potential enemy because I know what history teaches. Throughout the written history of mankind, when there was so much concentration of political power that the known world was divided between the areas of influence of two great powers, they inevitably locked in war. That has been the history of warfare in the world, since the Trojan War. It was true as between Greece and Persia. It was true as between Napoleon and Great Britain. It is true in our time. We have had two world wars; and, as I pointed out earlier this afternoon, the period of wars has been growing longer, and the period of peace between wars has been growing steadily shorter. We now stand upon the brink of war; and no one in the Congress or in the executive department—either in the State Department or in the White House—is able to predict what may be the next pitfall into which we may be dragged.

OIL FROM SHALE

It was back in 1943 that I began to realize what oil meant to the United States. It was on October 6, 1943, that I reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys a bill which was designated S. 1243, "authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes."

In the report I pointed out that the bill might well be termed a bill to assure the United States a continuous supply of domestically produced motor fuel and aviation gasoline. The military demands for petroleum and its products during the war have been so great that we are now burning up liquid fuel at the rate of approximately 1½ billion barrels of crude oil every year.

That was the report upon the bill which eventually became known as the O'Mahoney-Randolph synthetic fuel law. It was signed by the President on October 5, 1944, and became known as Public Law 290 of the 78th Congress.

Under that law, the Bureau of Mines began research to determine the possibility of producing economically liquid fuel from coal and oil shale.

I have before me a chart prepared by the Department of the Navy, which is in charge of the naval shale reserve near Rifle, Colo. The Navy has custody of that reserve. It was set aside by Executive order of the President on December 6, 1916, for just such a situation as that with which we are now confronted.

This chart shows the crude production in the United States. That is shown by the lower green line. It will be ob-

served that in 1943, when my bill for making liquid fuel from coal and oil shale was passed, the production in the United States was about 4½ million barrels a day. It gradually increased and then fell back, increased again, and fell again; but there was a gradual increase. So that almost 11 years later production had reached about 6,750,000 barrels of crude oil a day.

The unfortunate fact, however, is that the demand had been constantly growing greater, as the upper line on the graph shows. While the production in the United States increased, the demand was steadily increasing at a greater rate. Production for 1956 and 1957 is shown on the chart. The rest is a projection.

Because production in the United States does not meet the demand for our own people for their own personal use and of our Defense Department for our soldiers, sailors, marines, and fliers, oil must be imported.

The estimate of the best experts on geology who can be found show that by the year 1965, less than 10 years from today, the production in the United States will have leveled off and will then begin to decline. That is not surprising, because the search for oil began in the United States long before it began anywhere else in the world. The great companies which are now seeking for oil throughout the world, got their experience here. They developed their skills and their know-how. I would be the last to deprecate those skills in the search for oil and in producing it.

Naturally they are interested in bringing it into the United States, which is the great market for oil. The more oil they bring into the United States, the more serious becomes the problem for our own production, because we have drilled the surface of the United States for so long a time that we must now drill deeper and at a higher cost than ever before.

During the past few years we have allowed inflation to take us by the throat, economically speaking. The price of steel has been steadily rising. During the past 10 years it has risen constantly. There is another increase in the price of steel coming. The price charged by the great steel companies will be a tax upon every trade and industry in the United States. It will be a tax on drilling for oil because it will be more costly for the crude oil production companies to sink the deep wells.

The situation has become so serious that under section 7 of the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, passed in 1955, Congress provided that it shall be the duty of the President, when he finds that the defense of the United States is threatened to be impaired by reason of increased imports of any commodity, to impose restrictions on such imports.

That finding has been made. In 1955 that law was passed. An attempt was made to secure a limitation of imports by voluntary agreements among the importing oil companies. However, the importing oil companies are the large integrated companies which produce in foreign lands as well as in the United States. They transport the oil in tankers. They refine it in their refineries. They sell it in their own filling

stations. They operate throughout the whole span of the industry from the production of the crude to the sale of the gasoline and the lubricant in the corner filling station. There are many American companies which have not grown so great. Some are engaged only in refining. Some are engaged only in drilling for crude. Some companies are engaged only in retail selling. But the small companies cannot begin to compete with the huge, integrated units which import great quantities of oil.

THREAT OF IMPORTS

Recently there was a change of Directors in the Office of Defense Mobilization. Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, the retiring Director, had held some hearings on the question of determining whether the national security was being impaired, and he seemed to be about ready to ask for a curtailment. A demand arose from many Members of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, that steps be taken by Mr. Gordon Gray, the new head of the Office of Defense Mobilization. Mr. Gray took the matter under advisement. On April 23, 1957, he issued a memorandum for the President and was kind enough to send me a copy. It reads as follows:

Section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 requires the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization to advise the President whenever he has reason to believe that any article is being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security.

Under authority of this law and under authority of your assigning to a committee of Cabinet members consideration of energy supplies and resources policy, quite extensive investigation has been made of the effect upon national security of crude oil imports into the United States. The investigation clearly established that the rate of imports could reach a point at which the incentive for exploration and development in this country would be so reduced as to make us dependent upon overseas oil supplies to meet our national energy requirement.

Nothing can be more important than that statement by Mr. Gray. It is just about as clear as a statement can be. He says:

The investigation clearly established that the rate of imports could reach a point at which the incentive for exploration and development in this country would be so reduced as to make us dependent upon overseas oil supplies to meet our national energy requirement.

Let me read a statement from Platt's Oilgram, New York edition, Wednesday, May 15, 1957, under the heading "Increased Suez Transits Put Focus on Crude-Oil Prices in Persian Gulf."

The dispatch reads:

NEW YORK, May 14.—Resumed use of Suez Canal by British tonnage today, plus depression in spot tanker rates, leaves United States "wide open" for increased Middle East imports, according to trade sources here.

Crude-oil prices in Middle East have not—as yet—followed the upward trend started this year in the United States, Venezuela, and Canada. Barring early price changes in that area, prospect is that Middle East oils will undersell United States oils by substantial margin on both east, west, and gulf coasts of United States.

RATE OF IMPORTS

The Government figures on the imports of crude oil into the United States are as follows:

For the third quarter of 1956, 1,043,000 barrels daily.

For the fourth quarter of 1956, 916,000 barrels daily.

For the first quarter of 1957, 811,000 barrels daily.

Those declines were due to the fact that because of the European oil lift some Venezuelan and other South American oil was diverted to Western Europe.

For the 4 weeks ending May 3, 1957, the total amount of crude-oil imports into the United States was 901,000 barrels a day. The scheduled amount of imports for the last half of 1957 is estimated at 1,261,000 barrels daily.

Thus, the best authority that one can find in the oil industry indicates that the imports will continue to rise; and, as Mr. Gray said in his memorandum to the President, that will have a deleterious effect upon the operation of the United States oil industry and will make us dependent upon overseas oil supplies to meet our national energy requirements.

What does that mean? I have talked a long time before reaching this chart, but I think it is the most important chart I can call to the attention of the Senate. The chart represents the proven reserves in billions of barrels.

The world petroleum reserves amount to 200 billion barrels of oil.

Of that amount, 93,265,000,000 are in the Middle East—46 percent of the entire world reserves of petroleum.

What proportion does the United States have? Our proven reserves now are only 40 billion barrels. We have less than half of the proven reserves of petroleum which are in the Middle East alone.

We know we are talking about war and the preparation for war. What does the record in the United States show? The potential reserves of liquid fuel from the oil shale of the United States, which extends throughout the United States, is put down by the Navy Department as 1 trillion barrels of shale oil. What is a trillion? A trillion is a thousand billion.

The petroleum reserves are listed in terms of billions of barrels of oil. There are 200 billion barrels of oil in the world, with 40 billion in the United States. But the United States need not be dependent upon these foreign reserves for its defense, for its business, for its daily living, for the use of pleasure automobiles and other motor vehicles, because we have in the United States shale which will produce five times as much as the total petroleum reserves of the world.

FUEL YIELDS OF SHALE OIL

This chart shows that the average barrel of petroleum produces 9 percent of liquefied gas, 45 percent of gasoline, and 6 percent of jet fuel. If we are talking about airplanes and jet planes to defend the United States, we are interested in jet fuel. We cannot get as much jet fuel from petroleum—only 40 billion barrels—as we can get from a trillion barrels of oil shale.

Crude petroleum produces: diesel fuel, 16 percent; burner fuel, 16 percent; asphalt and lubricants and losses, and so forth, 8 percent.

Now let us examine the chart showing what a barrel of crude oil made from shale will produce: 10 percent of liquefied gas, 5 percent of gasoline, 38 percent of jet fuel—the fuel we need more than any other fuel for the expensive airplanes we are building for defense—33 percent of diesel fuel, only 4 percent in coke and losses.

In shale oil we have 71 percent of the defense fuels upon which the country depends.

I am happy to see on the floor the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], because his State of Utah, like the State of Wyoming and the State of Colorado, is rich in deposits of shale.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I am very happy the Senator from Wyoming is making this speech in regard to the reserves in the United States. The reserves in the three States, of which Utah is one, constitute one of the greatest reserves known in the world.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct; there can be no question about it.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the Senator from Wyoming return to the exhibit he displayed to the Senate a moment ago?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. WATKINS. It has to do with the refining of petroleum and the yield from it. I wish to ask a question about what can be obtained from a barrel of petroleum, as compared with a barrel of shale.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The chart shows that a barrel of crude petroleum yields 6 percent of jet fuel, as compared with 38 percent in the case of oil.

Mr. WATKINS. That is because of the difference in the chemical makeup of the shale oil, as compared with that of crude petroleum, is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. A barrel of crude petroleum produces 45 percent of gasoline, whereas a barrel of shale oil produces only 5 percent of gasoline. But the companies of the United States are constructing better engines which are able to obtain more mileage per gallon of gasoline, when used in pleasure vehicles.

Mr. WATKINS. I also am interested in the production of diesel fuel.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A barrel of crude petroleum will produce 60 percent of diesel fuel, and a barrel of shale will produce 33 percent of diesel fuel. In other words, the shale deposits in Utah are of very great value to the Navy, which uses diesel fuel for the propulsion of naval craft; and they are also of very great importance to the Army, which uses diesel fuel to propel many of its vehicles.

Mr. WATKINS. If the Navy does not desire to use for transportation purposes the oil shale which is available in these States, it can make use of the uranium

which can be used to develop atomic power.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. In those three States and in New Mexico is probably the overwhelming proportion of the uranium which is produced in the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Utah is quite correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming return to one of the other charts he has displayed to the Senate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. As I have previously stated, the chart to which I now refer shows the comparison between United States production, which is indicated by the green line, and United States demand. The gaps between the two must be filled by increasing imports and by synthetics. The increase in production in the United States will come to a stop in 1965—in just 8 years.

Because of the importance of this matter, I introduced on Monday, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] and myself, a bill to enable the Bureau of Mines to reestablish its operations.

AREA OF OIL SHALE

However, before referring to that bill, I wish to say to the Senator from Utah that I have made a computation of the area of oil shale in the Green River Basin, which includes the States of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, and I list them in alphabetical order:

Colorado has 2,592 square miles of oil shale; Utah has 4,680 square miles of oil shale; Wyoming has 9,192 square miles of oil shale. The total in the case of those three States alone is 16,464 square miles.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield further to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Wyoming repeat his observations about 1965? Did I correctly understand him to say that by 1965, the United States will have reached the maximum of its production of crude oil?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct; by that time the United States will have been explored so thoroughly that there will be no prospect of gaining additional reserves. As a matter of fact, the proportion of crude oil going into reserves, as compared with the proportion which is consumed daily, has been steadily declining during the past few years, so that today there is being discovered in the United States not more than 1,225,000 barrels of oil as compared with the demand of 1 million barrels, so that only one-quarter of a million barrels go into the reserves.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Wyoming now is referring to the chart entitled "The United States Petroleum Supply and Demand"; is he not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; and the Senator from Oregon has before him a photostatic copy of the large chart I am displaying to the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. The chart means that at the present time the United States is not producing sufficient crude oil to

meet the public demand in this country. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. The demand in the United States has been steadily increasing; our population is increasing; our business is increasing. Unless we make certain that we have a sure and certain supply, we shall be hard put to it.

I point out to the Senator from Oregon that during World War II, Hitler's submarines sank 114 United States-flag ships carrying crude oil from Venezuela to the east coast of the United States, there to be refined. But today the Russian submarine fleet is far better and more modern than Hitler's was. So it would be folly for the United States to expect that the necessary supplies of fuel for war could be obtained from the Middle East.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask another question, although probably the Senator from Wyoming has covered the point I have in mind. It was necessary for me to leave the Chamber for a few minutes, although I wished to hear as much of the speech of the Senator from Wyoming as I could. Of course, I shall read all of it tomorrow in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

My recollection is that the United States had in operation 1, and perhaps 2, experimental laboratories for the production of crude oil from shale. It is my recollection that those laboratories were discontinued a year or two ago. Does the Senator from Wyoming have the facts regarding that matter?

CLOSING SHALE OIL PLANTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy that the Senator has raised that question. I was just about to come to it.

I have in my hand a copy of the hearing before the Antitrust Subcommittee, Subcommittee No. 5, of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, 84th Congress, containing the record for July 26, 1956. It is entitled "WOC's and Government Advisory Groups." This record was developed when the House committee was trying to discover the regular business affiliations and activities of those who constituted advisory groups of government.

On page 2581 I find a letter from Mr. Felix E. Wormser, Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources, in the Department of the Interior. The letter was dated July 30, 1954. I shall not read the whole letter, but it was addressed to Mr. Walter Hallanan, president of the National Petroleum Council, at Pittsburgh, Pa. The letter reads, in part:

DEAR WALTER: One of the recommendations made to the Secretary of the Interior by a committee appointed to survey the operations of the Bureau of Mines related to the continued operation of the Government's oil-shale plant at Rifle, Colo.

The recommendation made by the committee and found on page 23 of the enclosed report, was as follows:

It is recommended (17) that the experimental work done solely by the Bureau on the production of oil shale and oil from shale at Rifle, Colo., should cease, and that no further work be done with the new retort unless there is a substantial contribution by industry under a cooperative agreement.

If industry feels that no further experimental work is necessary, then the facilities will have served the purpose for which they

were developed and constructed, and disposition should be made in accordance with established procedures.

On page 2590 of the same record to which I have made reference we find the list of the names of those who participated in the Committee on Oil Shale Policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the list of names be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON SHALE OIL POLICY

B. A. Hardy, Shreveport, La., chairman.
Hines H. Baker, Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.

Russell B. Brown, Independent Petroleum Association of America, Washington, D. C.
J. C. Donnell II, the Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

Fayette B. Dow, National Petroleum Association, Washington, D. C.

Warwick M. Downing, Denver, Colo.
Paul Endacott, Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.

W. W. Flenniken, Rocky Mountain Oil & Gas Association, Denver, Colo.

R. G. Follis, Standard Oil Company of California, San Francisco, Calif.

Clyde T. Foster, The Standard Oil Co. (Ohio), Cleveland, Ohio.

Eugene Holman, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), New York, N. Y.

A. Jacobsen, Amerada Petroleum Corp., New York, N. Y.

Paul Kayser, El Paso Natural Gas Co., El Paso, Tex.

J. Sayles Leach, the Texas Co., New York, N. Y.

Frank M. Porter, American Petroleum Institute, New York, N. Y.

M. H. Robineau, the Frontier Refining Co., Denver, Colo.

Roland V. Rodman, Anderson-Prichard Oil Corp., Oklahoma City, Okla.

P. C. Spencer, Sinclair Oil Corp., New York, N. Y.

D. T. Staples, Tide Water Associated Oil Co., San Francisco, Calif.

Henderson Supplee, Jr., the Atlantic Refining Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Sidney A. Swensrud, Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Reese H. Taylor, Union Oil Company of California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Robert E. Wilson, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), Chicago, Ill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the list is studded with the names of representatives of the Standard Oil Company of Indiana, Union Oil Company of California, Gulf Oil Corp., Atlantic Refining, Tide Water Associated Oil, Sinclair Oil Corp., American Petroleum Institute, the Texas Co., El Paso Natural Gas Co., Amerada Petroleum Corp., Standard Oil of New Jersey, Standard Oil of Ohio, and so on.

This is the group that rendered the report suggesting that the experimental operation of the Bureau of Mines should cease. I am happy, however, to read the names of the three who signed the dissenting report:

The committee, therefore, concurs in the recommendation of the Interior Department Committee to the Secretary of the Interior to the effect that the experimental work done solely by the Bureau of Mines on the production of oil shale and oil from shale at Rifle, Colo., should be discontinued for the present and that the facilities now on the site be maintained in standby condition.

Action: On motion made by Mr. Hardey, and duly seconded, the report of the com-

mittee on shale-oil policy was adopted with the following members voting in the negative:

Mr. Warwick M. Downing.

Mr. B. L. Majewski.

Mr. M. H. Robineau.

Mr. Majewski and Mr. Robineau are independent refiners who are not engaged in the production of oil, and Mr. Downing is a lifelong, well-known oil expert, and a practicing attorney of Denver, Colo.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a couple more questions?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I have a recollection that, in addition to the plant at Rifle, Colo., there was another experimental plant in Missouri, as I recall.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. A Government plant at Louisiana, Mo., which was built by the Government during the war for the production of ammonium, was ideally situated and ideally equipped for testing coal. Coal was tested there, but that coal operation was also abandoned.

It is absurd to think that in a critical situation such as we have now the Government should allow itself to be persuaded by the oil industry to stop research on what may be a competitive source of supply. I do not blame the oil companies for trying to hold to petroleum, except that I do not believe they have taken into consideration the critical posture in which the Nation stands.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. It has been about 3 years since I have made any study of this question, but I think I read in my previous study of it that the Rifle, Colo., plant had clearly demonstrated, No. 1, the scientific capability of producing oil from shale economically. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not think it went quite that far. The scientific possibility of refining liquid fuel from oil shale was demonstrated, but not that it could be produced at a competitive price as yet, but almost at a competitive price.

Mr. MORSE. But that it could be produced, and in view of increasing shortages, it would necessarily become more economical.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The outlook was excellent. More than that, may I say to the Senator, Hitler fought World War II with synthetic fuel.

Mr. MORSE. My next question is this: Is there a considerable amount of shale on federally owned land?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is.

Mr. MORSE. Does it not then follow that the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars for completion of research on this matter, to the end of trying to work it out to the point where oil may be economically produced, is definitely in the broad public interest, and definitely in the narrow public interest, in the sense that we would be spending the money there for the benefit of the people themselves, in increasing the value of their land in their own public interest?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The best answer I can give to that question is to read what the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman

of the House Committee on Military Affairs, said, when I testified before the committee, on March 20, 1957. At the conclusion of that testimony he made this remark:

I was here when we started off in synthetic rubber. Millions and millions of dollars were wasted because it was a crash program. Plan after plan had to be changed because we didn't have the know-how. But after spending millions and millions and hundreds of millions of dollars, we found out how to do it. We just merely want to carry on a small, little pilot plant, not get into the business. But we don't want the shale to be in the capacious bosom of Mother Earth and no effort being made to extract the oil.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I think probably more progress has been made in the recovery of oil produced from oil shale than we realize at this time. Only recently a very distinguished former colleague of ours, Ed Johnson, of Colorado, called on me. He is vitally interested in this matter. I think his home originally was in Craig, Colo., not far from where I used to live. He told me that one of the oil companies had gone ahead with this experimentation, based largely upon the discoveries which had been made.

UNION OIL'S PLANT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Union Oil Company of California has acquired some of the oil-shale land in and around the naval reserve. It is very anxious to undertake some research work. The president of that company, Mr. Rubel, told me only this morning that they have already expended about \$15 million in research, but they have not made the rapid progress they had hoped to make when they started back in 1955. They are asking now to have a depletion allowance of 27½ percent, as an incentive to the research. I am perfectly willing that they should have such a depletion allowance and such a stimulus. I think this whole program must be developed by stimulating it and providing incentive for the expenditure of funds. However, I do not believe that sufficient private funds will be available to do the work as it ought to be done.

The Union Oil Co. is intent only upon shale. Coal is another mineral, of which there is a great amount in Utah, as there is in Wyoming and in Colorado, from which chemical products and liquid fuel can be made.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. As I recall, former Senator Johnson advised me that the same company of which the Senator speaks, the Union Oil Co., had gone so far that they could envision a successful venture in extracting oil from shale.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that is the way they feel.

Mr. WATKINS. He said they were within sight of doing it, and they were interested in getting the same treatment as that accorded to other oil producers; that is, the 27½ percent depletion allowance. He said that was one of the things they needed now. I received the impression from him that they would be ready

in the very near future to go into production with one of these plants.

I wish to point out that I think we ought to give every encouragement to the oil companies of the United States, or to any other people who are interested in making investments, to invest money in ventures of this kind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. I think, as the Senator has stated, this allowance ought to be given. I was very much encouraged by what former Senator Johnson told me about the progress already made. It might relieve to that extent the heavily overburdened budget we now have, if we can get the other people to carry on the necessary research and investigation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am afraid they cannot do enough.

I wish to read from the testimony given before the Vinson committee on March 20, 1957, the same day that I testified. This testimony was given by Mr. Fred Hartley, the vice president of the Union Oil Company of California. He is the scientist in charge of the investigation. Representative GAVIN had asked him to supply some information, and he said:

Our recent progress report and what we have done to date.

Now, as to your question, what I stated yesterday was that retorting was difficult.

Retorting, of course, is the scientific operation by which the shale is put into a retort, the heat applied to it, and the oil obtained.

We have devised one scheme of doing the job. We have created that scheme by scientific thought, and originality.

In our process we push rock up through the retort and we bring combustion gases down, vertically. As a result of doing that we bring hot combustion gases in contact with the rising cold rock. This causes the rock to rise to the temperature at which retorting commences, which is in the temperature range of 700 to 1,000 degrees Fahrenheit. At that point, oil is released. It flows downward through the retort and is carried out and we end up with two products.

Product No. 1 is what we call raw shale oil.

Product No. 2 is off-gas; we call it retort product gas. It has a Btu value of about 100 Btu's per cubic foot. That compares to Texas natural gas of about 1,000 Btu's per cubic foot. Both materials represent vast sources of energy. The problem is to take that source of energy by having a proper retort.

Now, the Bureau's original thinking—and I understand from what was said, they have the basic patents so they must be the originators of the process, assuming the Patent Office did its job.

They (the Bureau of Mines) went the other way. They said that the rock should flow down, and the combustion gases should flow up—just exactly the opposite of our retort. And I wouldn't be a bit surprised that they think that the idea of pushing rock up is about as crazy as we think the idea of making the oil flow up.

But nevertheless, they might be right, and we might be right.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Whose testimony is the Senator reading?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The testimony of Mr. Hartley, the vice president of the

Union Oil Co. of California, an expert in the process.

Mr. WATKINS. When was the hearing held?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. March 20.

Mr. WATKINS. This year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This year.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senators who have listened to my speech this afternoon. I made this talk about the problem because I thought it was very necessary, particularly since there is now before the ODM and the President the necessity for a decision as to what action is to be taken.

ODM REPORTS THREAT

Mr. Gray reported to the President on April 23d, as I recall, that the national security would be impaired by the continued increase of imports, and the President 2 days later issued another statement in which he announced he accepted that judgment, that there was an impairment of security, thus bringing the matter under section 7 of the Reciprocal Trade Extension Act of 1955. The President may now fix the rule by which imports may be prorated. He has asked ODM to look into the possibility of a voluntary agreement.

I do not believe a voluntary agreement will work, because no voluntary agreement has been made in the past 2 years. A voluntary agreement requires that some of the importing companies surrender a part of the commodity which they are now bringing into the United States. I think the ODM should exercise the authority which Congress delegated, suggest the ratio—and the 1954 ratio would be a good ratio—impose it upon all the companies, and let them all share in a proper ratio.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Was that situation brought on partly by the blockade of the Suez Canal?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This was before the blockade, in 1955, when an amendment was offered by a group of Senators.

Mr. WATKINS. I refer to the recent action of the President and the ODM.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; as a result of that, because the imports continue to come in.

At the beginning of my talk this afternoon I read into the Record a statement of the facts showing that the estimates now on file with ODM show a substantial increase in the imports. This is the time to save our domestic capacity to produce petroleum, and it is the time to move forward with the testing of oil shale.

Mr. WATKINS. The local companies engaged in production in the United States do not object to imports, do they?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, the companies are objecting; certainly.

Mr. WATKINS. At the present time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. Positively. Vigorously. Emphatically.

Mr. WATKINS. I am sorry, but I got the impression at the start that it was a matter of prorating imports to possible customers in the United States. That is why I asked the question about the blockade.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. The point is that the imports undermine our own capacity to produce. The Senator will find that statement a little earlier in my remarks.

Mr. WATKINS. I am sorry I did not hear all the Senator's speech.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We cannot always have a full attendance. I am happy that the Senator entered the Chamber when he did.

Mr. WATKINS. Other appointments kept me from the Chamber during most of the afternoon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 312, Senate bill 358.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 358) to authorize the conveyance to the State of Wyoming of about 377⁷⁵/₁₀₀ acres of land comprising a part of Francis E. Warren Air Force Base.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the bill was reported unanimously from the Armed Services Committee. I have been in contact with the majority leader and minority leader, and both are in accord with the objectives of the bill.

The bill provides that 37 and a fraction acres of land now in the Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, near Cheyenne, shall be sold to the State of Wyoming at the appraised value. I anticipate that the property will be sold at an estimated value of \$19,000, which is a respectable sum for land in Wyoming.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Is this land to be sold to the State of Wyoming?

Mr. BARRETT. It is.

Mr. CARROLL. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming has stated, as I recall, that this matter has been cleared with the majority leader. Is that correct?

Mr. BARRETT. With the majority leader; that is correct. I might also say that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has no objection to the bill.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). The bill is open to amendment. If there be no

amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Wyoming, at the fair market value, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to about thirty-seven and seventy-five one-hundredths acres of land comprising a part of Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyo., and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point which is 303.4 feet north 73 degrees 55 minutes west from monument numbered 28, thence south 7 degrees 33 minutes west, 1,320.0 feet more or less, to the point of 1 degree 54 minutes curve to the left, the radius of which is 3,015.0 feet, thence along said curve through an angle of 21 degrees 05 minutes, a distance of 1,110.0 feet more or less, to a point on the old boundary of Francis E. Warren Military Reservation, thence north 89 degrees 48 minutes west, 660.0 feet more or less, to a point on the present boundary of Francis E. Warren Air Force Base Reservation, thence north 00 degrees 03 minutes east, 2,629.0 feet, more or less, to monument numbered 27, thence south 73 degrees 55 minutes east, 813.0 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning. Said parcel of land containing 37.75 acres, more or less.

Monument numbered 28 is located at a point 832.32 feet, north 73 degrees 55 minutes west of point which is 2,224.38 feet, south 70 degrees 9 minutes west of the east quarter corner of section 24, township 14 north, range 67 west.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Air Force may include in the deed of conveyance authorized under this act such terms as he considers to be in the public interest.

CITING OF EDWARD A. HINTZ FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have just consulted with the acting majority leader, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 232, Senate Resolution 124.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 124) citing Edward A. Hintz for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in September and October 1956, the Banking and Currency Committee held hearings in Washington and Chicago on the Illinois banking situation. One of the principal problems which the committee sought to explore was how the Illinois auditor of public accounts, the supervisor of the State banking system, was able to use a State bank, deposits in which were insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, in his thefts of State funds running into the millions. The hearings in Washington disclosed that the bank in question had been the subject of repeated criticism by FDIC, because of bad management, but no improvements were effected. Instead the bank went from bad to worse. The committee wished to explore the relationship,

if any, between the bank's bad management and the bank's participation in the thefts.

One of the principal witnesses the committee wished to question in Chicago was Edward A. Hintz, executive vice president, later president of the bank. Hintz was the man who personally handled the fraudulent State warrants, and kept the secret account of stolen money. He had been questioned, not under oath, by the staff in the course of its preliminary inquiries, and obviously had a great deal of information of importance to the investigation.

Accordingly, the committee had Hintz brought before it in Chicago, from Joliet where he was serving under concurrent Federal and State sentences for his part in these thefts.

Hintz objected to the manner in which the hearings were conducted by the committee. He refused to be sworn or to testify except under the following conditions:

While he was in the hearing room, television cameras must be turned off entirely; while he was testifying, moving-picture cameras, radio and other recording equipment must not be operated, and still photographs must not be taken in the room.

A number of reasons were given for these demands. The only reason which even had any appearance of validity was that the witness might be confused and unable to testify correctly under the circumstances.

After recessing to consider the matter carefully, these demands were rejected. The committee offered to have the live television cameras turned away from the witness during his testimony, as had been done at the request of a previous witness.

The argument relating to confusion was based on the *Kleinman* case (107 F. Supp. 407) where a witness was excused for refusing to testify because of confusion. In the Chicago hearings, however, the situation was, in my judgment, completely different. The hearing room, though full, had been extremely orderly during the previous testimony, and the representatives of the press, radio, and television had conducted themselves entirely satisfactorily during the previous testimony. And a brief colloquy with the witness on the subject of his many previous experiences as a professional prize fight judge under live television left no question of his ability to testify correctly under the circumstances.

Accordingly, when Hintz persisted in his refusal to be sworn or to answer any questions under the arrangements prescribed for the hearing, in spite of being warned of the consequences, he was taken from the hearing room and the hearing proceeded with other witnesses, but without the benefit of the testimony which would have been obtained from this key witness.

This refusal was considered by the Banking and Currency Committee, which reported out, and recommends that the Senate adopt, Senate Resolution 124, providing for the prosecution of Edward A. Hintz for this refusal.

I ask that an excerpt from the report of the Banking and Currency Commit-

tee—Report No. 232—be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Banking and Currency met on July 27, 1956, and approved a resolution authorizing an investigation of the Illinois banking situation and other matters in the committee's jurisdiction, and further authorizing the holding of hearings on the subject outside the District of Columbia.

The Committee on Banking and Currency, under rule XXV, paragraph (d), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, has jurisdiction over all proposed legislation and other matters pertaining to the following subjects:

1. Banking and currency generally.

8. Deposit insurance.

The investigation of the Illinois banking situation was based, among other factors, on disclosure of the fact that Edward A. Hintz, the executive vice president (later president) of the Southmoor Bank & Trust Co., of Chicago, Ill., a State bank, deposits in which were insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (64 Stat. 873; 12 U. S. C. 1811), and which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation had charged with unsafe and unsound banking practices, had participated with the auditor of public accounts of Illinois, whose responsibilities included chartering and supervising State banks, in cashing at that bank fictitious and fraudulent State warrants in large amounts.

Following an investigation by the committee's staff in Washington and Chicago, the committee held hearings on September 21 and 25, 1956, at which representatives of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation testified, among other things, concerning their actions in connection with the situation at the Southmoor Bank & Trust Co., and concerning the adequacy of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to protect the interests of the United States and the insured depositors. It was thereafter determined to hold public hearings in Chicago, Ill., at which testimony could be obtained from witnesses having knowledge of the administration of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, including particularly Edward A. Hintz.

As Edward A. Hintz was at that time confined at the Illinois State Penitentiary at Stateville-Joliet, Ill., in the custody of the warden of that institution, the chairman, after communicating with the Governor of the State of Illinois and the director of public safety of Illinois, petitioned the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, for the issuance out of that court of a writ of habeas corpus ad testificandum to the warden of the Illinois State Penitentiary at Stateville-Joliet, Ill., to bring Edward A. Hintz, and others, before the committee to testify at its hearings. This petition was approved and the writ requested was granted on October 4, 1956.

In accordance with this writ of habeas corpus ad testificandum, Edward A. Hintz was brought by the said warden to the United States Courthouse at Chicago, Ill., and was held there subject to the direction of the committee.

On October 9, 1956, the committee, having concluded taking testimony from previous witnesses, was ready to take the testimony of Edward A. Hintz. Before calling him to the witness stand, the committee, at the request of Edward A. Hintz, permitted John M. Leonard, Jr., Esq., attorney for Edward A. Hintz, to address it. Mr. Leonard, on behalf of his client, objected to the presence in the hearing room of television and moving picture cameras, radio equipment, and still cameras, and stated he would advise Edward

A. Hintz not to testify except under the following conditions:

While Edward A. Hintz was in the hearing room, television cameras must be turned off; and, while Edward A. Hintz was testifying, moving-picture cameras, radio, and other recording equipment must not be operated and still photographs must not be taken anywhere in the room.

The chairman ruled that these conditions were unacceptable, and that the hearing would proceed in accordance with the procedures previously established at the hearing; namely, the live television cameras would not be directed at a witness while he was testifying if he so requested, and still photographers would remain behind the witness' table while he was testifying.

Edward A. Hintz, having been called to the witness stand, thereupon refused to be sworn as a witness, and refused to answer one or more questions pertinent to the matter under inquiry, as appears in the record of such hearings on October 9, 1956, which record is made a part of this report. Excerpts from the record of these hearings are annexed and designated as "Exhibit No. 1."

As a result of the refusal of the said Edward A. Hintz to be sworn as a witness or to answer pursuant to such inquiry those questions put to him, as appears in the record, the committee was prevented from receiving testimony concerning the matter under inquiry by the committee.

The Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate met on April 11, 1957, and, after reviewing the facts in this matter set forth in this report, resolved to present to the United States Senate, for its action, a resolution requiring the United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois to proceed against the said Edward A. Hintz in the manner and in the form prescribed by law.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, attached to the report is a copy of relevant parts of the testimony at the hearing. I should point out, for the sake of completeness, that Mr. Hintz' appearance—the proceedings beginning on page 11 of the report after the asterisks—occurred on October 9, 1956, the second day of the hearings. I ask unanimous consent that the following excerpt from page 359 of the transcript of the hearings on the Illinois banking situation showing the formal opening of the hearings on October 9, 1956, be inserted in the RECORD at this point, and included with the report certified to the United States Attorney, to show that the material beginning after the asterisks on page 11 of the report is an excerpt from the committee's proceedings on October 9, 1956.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE
ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Chicago, Ill., October 9, 1956.

The committee met, pursuant to recess, in room 209, Federal Court Building, at 9:45 a. m., Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senator FULBRIGHT.

Also present: Robert A. Wallace, staff director; Donald L. Rogers, counsel; Matthew Hale, counsel; J. H. Yingling, chief clerk; and James B. Cash, Jr., staff member.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. Will you bring in the witness, please.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there has been much discussion on the subject of publicity for congressional hearings, including particularly the matter of radio, television, and newsreel

coverage. Congressional hearings must be conducted in an atmosphere and under circumstances which will enable a committee to obtain truthful, accurate, and complete testimony. If coverage of hearings by any media of communications prevents obtaining such testimony, the communications media must yield to the more important objective. But where arrangements can be made for providing full coverage for all communications media, without interfering with the orderly conduct of a hearing, under circumstances permitting truthful, accurate, and complete testimony, I am convinced that it is entirely proper, and highly desirable, to permit all media of communications to have full and equal opportunity to bring information to the public.

I urge the adoption of Senate Resolution 124.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 124) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Edward A. Hintz to answer questions before the Committee on Banking and Currency, said questions being pertinent to the question under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, to the end that the said Edward A. Hintz may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

LENDING OPERATIONS OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in 1953, at the time of the abolition of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Secretary Humphrey and others contended that the lending operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would result in a loss to the Government.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the testimony of Secretary Humphrey before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on May 21, 1953.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM HEARINGS BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, 83d CONGRESS, 1st SESSION, THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1953, ON THE SUBJECT OF GOVERNMENT LENDING AGENCIES—TESTIMONY OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY HUMPHREY

Senator FULBRIGHT. Is it your contention that the RFC has been an extravagant and wasteful organization?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think it has been in the past.

Senator FULBRIGHT. You do?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Yes.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Has it cost the taxpayers anything?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think it is going to cost the taxpayers a good deal of money.

Senator FULBRIGHT. I say has it up to now?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, it all depends on how you keep your books.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Do you think that it has?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Yes, I think it will cost—

Senator FULBRIGHT. Not "will." Nobody knows what is going to happen under the new administration. Up to now, do you allege that it has cost the taxpayers anything?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think, Senator, if you estimate it, you will find the RFC has cost you money, particularly—

Senator FULBRIGHT. You are not willing to say it has, in your opinion?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, I cannot say it, because I have not actually figured it out. But, if you allow interest at what it costs for the money that RFC used and loaned out, and if—

Senator FULBRIGHT. You know under the law that was not provided.

Secretary HUMPHREY. I know, but that is just part of it. When the Treasury has to pay interest out to the public for a lot of money here, you cannot say you are making money.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this question has recurred from time to time since then and I asked Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Robbins to furnish me a statement on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point Mr. Robbins' letter of May 7, 1957 and the enclosure thereto which is a Consolidated Statement of Net Income From Lending Activities from the RFC.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 7, 1957.

The Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Banking and Currency
Committee, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: In compliance with a telephone request from Mr. Yingling

a few days ago, I take pleasure in handing you two copies of a consolidated statement of net income from lending activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Because of the interest expressed by you on previous occasions, we began sometime ago to compile and consolidate these figures and the work has just now been completed.

The statement shows actual figures from the date of incorporation to March 31, 1957, and estimated figures to the date of the proposed abolition of the Corporation, June 30, 1957. The figure headed "Net Income (per RFC Records)" is what the books show after deducting various categories of expense, including interest actually paid. The final figure headed "Adjusted Net Income," which is explained in the footnote, is more realistic.

I hope you will find this statement satisfactory.

Sincerely yours,

LAURENCE B. ROBBINS,
Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation—Consolidated statement of net income from lending activities

	For the cumulative period from date of incorporation to—			For the cumulative period from date of incorporation to—	
	Mar. 31, 1957	June 30, 1957 (estimated)		Mar. 31, 1957	June 30, 1957 (estimated)
INCOME			INTEREST AND OTHER EXPENSES—CON.		
Interest and dividends on loans and securities (includes approximately \$135,000,000 received from other U. S. Government agencies).....	\$1, 441, 960, 215	\$1, 442, 709, 657	Fees paid for servicing mortgages, etc.....	\$18, 402, 217	\$18, 402, 217
Premiums realized and discounts collected on loans and securities, principally premiums on sales of public agency bonds, FHA insured mortgages and railroad securities.....	56, 726, 936	56, 726, 936	Other expenses, including depreciation on administrative property and administrative property transferred to other U. S. Government agencies without reimbursement.....	914, 838	939, 500
Commitment and other fees, principally from RFC subsidiary corporations, RFCMC and FNMA.....	12, 305, 141	12, 305, 141	Total expenses.....	710, 665, 186	710, 914, 854
Participation fees earned.....	10, 439, 460	10, 439, 460	Net income before losses and reserve provisions.....	811, 462, 376	811, 962, 321
Other income.....	695, 810	695, 981	LOSSES AND RESERVE PROVISIONS		
Total income.....	1, 522, 127, 562	1, 522, 877, 175	Loans, securities and other receivables charged off, less income and profits from acquired assets.....	106, 474, 248	106, 536, 970
INTEREST AND OTHER EXPENSES			Provision for losses on loans, securities and other receivables not yet liquidated.....	20, 393, 843	15, 631, 441
Interest on funds:			Total.....	126, 868, 091	122, 168, 411
Borrowed from U. S. Treasury.....	279, 415, 299	279, 415, 299	Net income (per RFC records)—Note.....	684, 594, 285	689, 793, 910
Borrowed from the public.....	86, 481, 808	86, 481, 808	Deduct: Increase in interest expense to reflect the average rate paid by the Treasury applicable to RFC's borrowings, capital stock and accumulated earnings.....	355, 611, 852	356, 326, 227
Held for U. S. Treasury and others (derived principally from the World War II programs, including War Damage Corporation, temporarily utilized in the lending program).....	61, 377, 562	61, 377, 562	Adjusted net income.....	328, 982, 433	333, 467, 683
Total interest paid.....	427, 274, 669	427, 274, 669			
Administrative expense.....	264, 073, 462	264, 298, 468			

NOTE.—The net income as reported by RFC was computed after deducting operating expenses and the actual amount of interest paid on funds borrowed from the U. S. Treasury and others, and represents net earnings as shown on the books of the Corporation. Had the Corporation paid interest to the Treasury on all funds

advanced by the Treasury, plus accumulated earnings of the Corporation, at a rate representing the average cost of those funds to the Treasury, net earnings of the Corporation would have been as shown above under "Adjusted net income."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it will be noted from this statement that for the period from the date of incorporation in 1932 to March 31, 1957, the adjusted net income of the RFC from lending activities was \$328,982,433. It is estimated that for the period ending June 30, 1957 this figure will reach \$333,467,683.

This is after deducting an amount for increase in interest expense to reflect the average rate paid by the Treasury applicable to RFC's borrowings, capital stock and accumulated earnings. I agree with the note on the statement that this deduction is a proper one.

Secretary Humphrey's testimony states that question of whether or not RFC lending activities cost money "depends on how you keep your books." Senators will be interested that according to the way Mr. Humphrey's Treasury Department keeps the books the RFC will have earned \$333,467,683 as of June 30, 1957.

**ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A. M.
TOMORROW**

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand adjourned until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, May 17, 1957, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 16, 1957:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Hartwell Davis, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Alabama for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires June 9, 1957.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Darrell O. Holmes, of Washington, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington for a term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires June 3, 1957.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under section 8294 of title 10, United States Code, as modified by section 1 of the act of April 30, 1956, chapter 223 (70 Stat. 119), with a view to designation, under section 8067 of title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

James D. Boyle, AO3041916.
Earl H. Cramer, AO3002433.
Roy J. Kelly, AO864261.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Russell W. Combs, AO2241410.
Robert E. Furr, AO3000413.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

Donald D. Baker
John A. Dotterer
Edward B. Edrington, AO2245505.
Richard F. Hench, AO3045950.
Frederick L. Jones, Jr., AO3074766.
Gordon C. MacLeod, AO3045973.
Donald M. Moore, AO3074758.
Robert C. Pfeiler, AO2208262.
James R. Rasch, AO2246056.
Austin R. Sawvell
Glen D. Sockwell, AO2246190.
Claude A. Taylor, Jr.
James R. Wamsley, AO3045975.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

Harvey T. Best, Jr.
Bernard M. Carr, AO3001255.
Billy M. Harrison, AO3042533.
Richard A. Henry, Jr., AO3042615.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of title II, Public Law 737, 84th Congress (Armed Forces Regular Officer Augmentation Act of 1956), with a view to designation, under section 8067 of title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated:

To be captains, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Wilbur C. Bentley, AO2236183.
Everett Caselman, Jr., AO2095365.
Archie L. Henson, AO1864582.
Merrill Q. Horton, AO2216287.
William C. Knopke, AO1865940.
Grosvenor H. Letarte, AO2253184.
Joseph R. Lowry, AO2251230.
Joseph B. McMullin, AO1313768.
Alexander L. Rogers, AO2248879.
William E. Skinner, AO2216309.
Claude T. Slagle, Jr., AO941254.
John C. Wasson, AO795001.
Allan L. Zbar, AO2216153.

To be captains, USAF (Chaplain)

George S. Bieber, AO2218386.
Thomas M. Campbell, Jr., AO2255007.
Sudderth A. Harms, AO1858319.
Harold D. Jester, AO2253182.
Robert M. Moore, AO2249314.
Joseph W. Pridgen, AO2233789.
Fredrick D. Sundloff, AO2240497.
Frank L. Yashkas, AO2253125.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Judge Advocate)

George F. Boney, AO3011280.
Paul A. Gross, AO1865345.
William A. Martin, AO3046469.
James D. Mazza, AO1854236.
Joseph W. Morrow, Jr., AO3008508.
George O. Wilson III, AO3020514.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Chaplain)

Starke S. Dillard, Jr., AO2255164.
Ervin D. Ellison III, AO2068534.
Nicholas T. Kiryluk, AO2255907.
Neunert F. Lang, AO2255107.
John J. McGowan, AO2255305.
David E. Rathjen, AO2261883.
Charles H. Wilkens, AO2255038.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of section 1211, title 10, United States Code:

To be captain

George E. Webster, 14662A.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of first lieutenant, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of title II, Public Law 737, 84th Congress (Armed Forces Regular Officer Augmentation Act of 1956):

Billy J. Athey, AO3019789.
Robert R. Basham, AO2220438.

Derwin L. Bohne, AO3019264.
William D. Borgen, AO3025951.
Robert D. Bromley, AO3016962.
Thomas A. Burris, AO3026024.
Edward F. Burt, AO3026190.
Francis J. Clark, Jr., AO3026340.
Jesse K. Corder, AO3033696.
James P. Daley, AO3016757.
Raymond E. Deane, Jr., AO3018851.
Robert H. Dixon, AO3020046.
Robert T. Dobson, AO3021461.
Ronald E. Droste, AO3026053.
Dale L. Fulton, AO3026195.
Thomas N. Glenn, AO3026282.
Lewis P. Hackley, Jr., AO3026353.
James E. Hagler, AO3026286.
Edwin R. Hayek, AO3026396.
Ronald M. Jacobs, AO3015809.
William O. Jacobs, AO3018762.
Randall A. Johnston, AO3026297.
Elmer R. Joyner, AO3026356.
Robert D. Livingston, AO3019346.
William R. Loewe, AO3033634.
Paul G. Logsdon, Jr., AO3026403.
Dominic D. LoMurro, AO3017305.
Byron L. Marvin, AO3024557.
James J. McGuigan, AO3026304.
Daniel G. McIntosh, AO3019509.
Robert G. McKenzie, AO3019398.
Donald J. Parkhurst, AO3026416.
Frederick D. Quick, AO3012103.
Marc L. Reid, AO3026180.
Durreth D. Robbins, AO3019002.
James S. Robinson, AO3019910.
Kevin T. Ryan, Jr., AO3019911.
Henry J. Ryland, AO3019912.
Gustavus H. Scott, AO3025826.
William A. Sears, Jr., AO3019892.
Arthur D. Seely, AO3026317.
Robert L. Sell, AO3018842.
Kenneth D. Shanklin, AO3010286.
Carlton E. Smith, AO3012951.
John T. Taylor, AO3026322.
Teddy N. Taylor, AO3026013.
Duane L. Thenhaus, AO3010768.
Jerald H. Thompson, AO3008295.
William J. Walker, AO3026213.
Ernest E. Walkup, Jr., AO3020375.
Alfred H. Wiemann, AO2247867.
Jesse P. Wiggins, AO3033692.
Donald R. Williams, AO3020442.
Robert L. Zambenini, AO3026231.

The following-named former cadet, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, effective and with date of rank June 4, 1957, under the provisions of section 203 (d), Public Law 737, 84th Congress (Armed Forces Regular Officer Augmentation Act of 1956):

Patrick J. Crakes, AO3040132.

The following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 203 (e), Public Law 737, 84th Congress (Armed Forces Regular Officer Augmentation Act of 1956). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Douglas Stuart Alexander
Harlan Glenn Allen, Jr.
Jefferson Zeno Amacker, Jr.
Glen Miller Andrews
Neal Edwin Ausman, Jr.
Archie Don Barrett
Robert Parker Bateman
Dean Elwood Bates
Gene Edward Belmforde
David Paul Bernd
Martin Gilbert Bradley
Kenneth Bryan
Robert Warren Buckner
Lee Burner
William Franklin Campbell, Jr.
William Thomas Carter
Paul Norman Chase
Richard William Christensen
Robert Purcell Christiansen

William Royer Clark
William Thomas Cudmore
Alfred Harry Davidson III
Donald Haydn Davis
Thomas Edmond Dayton
William Douglass Deegan
John Robert DeSola
Raymond Daryl Dixon
Thomas Hugh Dougherty
Gerald Thomas Dwyer
John Dorsett Ellington
Arthur Berry Ellison
Jack Kyle Farris
Byron Starr Fitzgerald
William Henry Foster, Jr.
Frederick Charles Freathy, Jr.
Robert Don Freeman
Robert Foster Gadd III
Turner Maurice Gauntt, Jr.
Edward LeRoy Gee
David Parker Gibbs, Jr.
John Thomas Gleason, Jr.
Benedict Emmanuel Glyphis
Flay Octavius Goodwin, Jr.
William Warren Gude
William Patrick Hamm
Claude Greene Hammond, Jr.
John Oren Hanford
Giles Dexter Harlow, Jr.
Kelly Mayo Harp
Elmer Russell Harris
Howard Francis Haupt II
Maurice Leonard Hazelrigs
Mark Conover Heath, Jr.
Jack Elwyn Hesse, Jr.
Charles Urban Hindman
Douglas Wister Howell, Jr.
Richard VanArman Huile
Richard Glenn Hurlburt
Gerald Leon Jagrowski
Stanley Frederick Jensen
Robert Leighton Jones, Jr.
Michael Roy Keating
Harper Brown Keeler
James Franklin Knight
Herbert John Koops
Gottfried Herman George Krafft
Donald Joseph Kutyna
Amherst Robert Lamb
Timothy Gardner Lawton
Nelson Marquis Lynde III
Joseph Bingham Mack, Jr.
Robert Fredrick Markham
Cyril Louis Massar, Jr.
Joseph Leonard Masterson
John William McClanahan
Robert Paul McCoy
Owen O'Henry McIntyre
Thomas Vincent McMahon
Lawrence Fallon McNeil
John Dean McSpadden, Jr.
William Harry Meyerholt
Jerome Anthony Meyers
Donald Leslie Miller
Richard Anthony Mollicone
James Walter Mooring
Samuel Morthland
Lawrence Henry Mulligan
William Harvey Lowe Mullins
James Robert Murphy
Lawrence Joseph Murphy
Paul Osborne Olsen
Jose Jesus Olvera
Joseph William O'Neil
William Francis Hurley Page
Douglas Patterson
Michael James Petruno
Stephen Barclay Place
William Harrison Pope
Christ John Poulos
Leslie John Prichard
Edward Beeding Quill, Jr.
Charles Joseph Quinn
Walter Joseph Rabe
David Preston Ray
Frank Jackson Redd
Herbert Charles Rice
William Charles Ringler
Robert Rodriguez
Craven Clark Rogers, Jr.
Donald Dean Rowland

Thomas Anthony Rush, Jr.
James Franklin Russell
John Vernon Schafer, Jr.
Paul Jerome Schwehm
John Eugene Setnicky
John Dennis Shannon
John Harold Slaney
Frederic Harrison Smith III
Duncan Padgett Smyly
Craig Harrison Smyser
Ralph Wesley Stephenson
Douglas Wilson Stockton
Willis Morris Thomson
Julius Anthony Tieber III
Robert Lynton Veal, Jr.
Benjamin Edward Waller III
William Bryan Webb
Frederick Leonard Wells
Robert LaVern Wessel
Charles Howard Wheeler
Richard Then White
Robert Youngblood White
John Louis Wiegner, Jr.
Gordon Edmund Williams
Leon John Wilson, Jr.

The following-named midshipmen, United States Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 203 (e), Public Law 737, 84th Congress (Armed Forces Regular Officer Augmentation Act of 1956). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Arthur Henry Ahrens, Jr.
Robert Lytle Albertson
Melvin Gary Alkire
Arthur James Altenburg
Gerald Marshall Anderson
Howard Vincent Andre, Jr.
Harry Joe Andrews
John Rosario Antonicelli
Robert Frank Arnold
Manuel Jose Baca, Jr.
John Duane Balent
Stanley Arthur Bass
Neil Gaillard Bates
Charles Anthony Bauknecht
Richard George Baum
Brooks Glenwood Bays
Gerald Herbert Bee, Jr.
Robert John Began
Stephen Charles Berger
Raymond Robert Betcher, Jr.
Edwin Leroy Biggers
Ronald John Bates Bishop, Jr.
John Edward Bortz
George Charles Bouvet
Gardner Brewer
Alan Burton Brown, Jr.
Robert Mack Brown
Lawrence Elmer Bustle, Jr.
Bart C Campbell
Matthew Mark Cannon
Clyde Chaney
Richard Maurice Chanslor
John Anthony Ciula
Don Alvin Clark
John Henry Cochrane
Jerome H Court
Donald Joseph Couture
Harold Sutton Coyle, Jr.
Daniel Newton Crewe
George Francis Cudahy
Roy Stewart Dahnke
Ray Elsworth Davis, Jr.
Jerry Stanley DeHimer
Lucian Keith DeMott
George Francis Dempsey
Peter Anthony DeVito
Robert Maurice Dixon
Herb Doby
Joseph Patrick Doherty
William George Dolan, Jr.
Edward Patrick Doyle
Ronald Curtis Dressel
Richard Joseph Ducote
Joseph Charles Duffley
Charles Moss Duke, Jr.
Robert Frank Dundervill, Jr.

Anthony William Dunlosky, Jr.
Eugene Peter Durbin
Charles Werner Edison
Fred Joseph Federici, Jr.
Barry Neal Fink
Donald Herbert Fisher
Roger Triplett Flora
Clarence Fong
Milton Dewey Forsyth, Jr.
John Lewis Funkhauser
James Miller Gallagher
Norman Edward Gammons
Kurt William Gareiss
James Blewett Gasho, Jr.
Jerauld Richard Gentry
Franklin D Gibson
Loran William Gierhart
John William Gilstrap, Jr.
Nicholas George Gionis
Carter Monroe Glass
Norman Trudel Gleneck
Paul Dominic Gober
William Bernard Goggins, Jr.
Robert Thomas Grigsby
Paul Charles Hamilton
John William Hansborough, Jr.
Lawrence William Hansen
Forrest Robert Hanvey, Jr.
Clarence James Hattings
Archibald James Heckler, Jr.
William John Heske
Donald Leigh Hirst
Terrence Eugene Hobbs
James Nelson Hockney
William Everett Hodge
Walter Lawson Hogg
John Allen Homnick
Charles Melvin Houtz
Donald Lee Huguley
Ernest Lafayette Jenkins, Jr.
Ronald Andrew Jensen
Ronald John Jensen
Robert Earl Johnson
Robert William Johnston
Charles William Jones
Donald Edward Jones
Joseph Paul Junker
George Neshan Kachigian
Robert Howard Kase
John Joseph Kelly
Vincent Michael Kerrigan
Karl William Koch
Bernard Raymond Kompa
Joseph Charles Ksyeewski
Richard Henry Lally
Cormac Martin Lannon
Eugene Lewis Larson
Marion Sneed Lary, Jr.
Hilbert Charles Lehman
Burton Sandford Liebesman
Ronald Gene Linder
Jay Dahl Lindquist
Arden Charles Llewellyn, Jr.
Ray Evans Lucas
Joseph Bruce Hunter Madison
Edward Francis Maloney
Edward Eugene Malynn
Stuart William Marcotte
Morton Herman Marks
Harvey Russel Martin
Robert Alexander Mazik
Dennis Arthur McCormick
Donald Gene McCoy
Robert Trimble McElwee
Daniel Michael McGurl, Jr.
John Stephen McKean
George Wildes McKemie
Robert James McMahon
William Wasdell McMahon
Robert Lawrence Merle
Norman Elliott Miner, Jr.
William Theodore Mohn, Jr.
Olbert Vincent Monto
Robert Bronaugh Morrow, Jr.
William John Murphy
John Dean Newman
Edward Franklin Nikkola
John Barela Ogas
John William O'Grady
Wayne Hamilton Oldfield
Albert Louis Pagani

Edward Joseph Palanek
Philip Nunzio Papaccio
Bradford Wells Parkinson
Robert Bayard Patrick
Jerry Gray Patterson
Oliver James Peake
Ronald White Peterson
Gerald Wayne Putnam
James Harvey Ramberger
John Donald Regenhardt
Herbert Edwin Rice
James William Rooney
Robert Alan Rosenberg
Thomas Lisle Roth
Roger Dixon Rothwell
Douglas Alan Roysdon
Monroe Stephens Ruffner
John Wallace Russell
Joseph Michael Samborsky
John Michael Sedano
William Eugene Sheppard
Kent Withers Slaughter
Edwin Dean Smathers, Jr.
Wendell Wayne Smiley, Jr.
David Albert Smith
Richard Ivan Smith
Delmar Edward Snider, Jr.
William Marion Snow, Jr.
Richard Harry Spackman
Roland Arthur Stebbins
Shawn Howard Steinke
John James Stewart
Floyd Ronald Stuart
James Hyatt Sturtevant
Dean Charles Swanson
Robert Emerson Swartz
Donald Frederick Swenor
Carman William Swenson
Charles Frederick Swope
John Robert Taylor
Alan Robert Thoeny
Edgar Frank Thomas
Frederick Lowell Thomas
George Joseph Thomas, Jr.
Gary Jon Thompson
George Eugene Thompson
Stephen Phelps Thurman
John Butler Tillman
William Thomas Tilson
Thomas Edward Timothy
Richard John Toner
Julio Luis Torres, Jr.
Michael Joseph Trimpert
Eugene Michael Vallerie III
Raymond Louis Vieira
Jordan Carrison Waite
Glen Eugene Warner
Peter Watcher
Edward Francis Welsh
Edwin Knapton Whiting
Robert Frederick Wiesenauer
Richard Errol Willes
Roger Clyde Williamson
Ivan Lee Wolinsky
James Alexander Woods
John Robert Worrell, Jr.
David Irvin Wright
John Hairston Wright
James Willard Zeberlein
James Warren Zimmer

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 16, 1957:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Elmer F. Bennett, of Colorado, to be Solicitor for the Department of the Interior.

Roger Charles Ernst, of Arizona, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

GOVERNOR OF ALASKA

Michael A. Stepovich, of Alaska, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Andrew Parker, of the District of Columbia, to be a member, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, term expiring March 3, 1962.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Maurice E. Curtis, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of admiral while serving in special assignments.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to the grade indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be ensign

Clarence Fong

To be ensign (special duty only, communications) in the Navy

John L. Funkhauser

To be ensign in the Navy as previously nominated, to correct name

James "D" Paulk, Jr.

To be ensigns in the line of the Navy in lieu of ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated

James C. Ballantine, Jr.

Gary D. Matthews

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to the grade indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be ensigns

Charles W. Adcock	James O. Machlan
Dean K. Allen	Arnold Mangham
Robert C. Arnett	Warren L. Martin
Daniel L. Ash	John S. Matherne
James S. Barber	Ronald L. Munroe
Walter G. Beckwith	Daniel B. Newton
George L. Beierling, Jr.	Ralph P. Norris
William E. Bendix	Thomas F. X. O'Rourke, Jr.
Burton O. Benson	Edward J. Pasternak
Gordon M. Binder	Arturo A. Pico
Robert J. Bitts	David G. Pyle
James H. Booker	William F. Reeve
Robert E. Bowles	Martin S. Roberts III
William L. Breed	Raymond G. Roble
James D. Browning	Harland F. Romberg
Paul L. Chapdelaine	Leon B. Rosseau, Jr.
John C. Cooper	Stephen E. Rowe
Charles L. Cowan	Cary H. Rush
Francis L. Cundari	Louis R. Salvator
Gerald M. Dallas	William A. Sanders
Horace W. Diamond, Jr.	Kenneth H. Santoro
James C. Edenfield	Alan A. Schick
Thomas H. Feron	William W. Seaton, Jr.
John F. Ferri	John A. Shaffner
Edwin L. Fields	Wayne D. Sharbrough, Jr.
John H. Fishburn	Charles S. Shoemaker
David G. Franz	David E. Sonon
Cyrus F. Freidheim	Joseph P. Spetz
James J. Geddes	Charles T. Stephens
Roy N. Gillespie	Robert F. Stover
Carlos B. Greer	Ronald L. Swan
Charles B. Gustafson	Kenneth R. Swimm
Delmont C. Hadley	Howard D. Thompson
James Hanemann, Jr.	William B. Truesdale
Walter D. Harvey	Barry B. Walters
Harold J. Haynes	Leith D. Wimmer
John T. Helm III	Don R. Winner
Thomas J. Henry	John S. Worrell
Frank S. Hill	Ralph Zaaenga
William W. Hill	Burton E. Baer
Robert F. Hoerle	Larry A. Beck
Glenn W. Hohman	John R. Blue
Charles E. Hutchinson	Richard G. Cline
William W. Hymes	David M. Connor, Jr.
John A. Jones	Richard H. Crain
Donald J. Kazimir	Raymond A. Elosua
Kenneth H. Keller	Harvey E. Field
Dennie J. Koupal	Thomas M. Finerty
Dwight R. Ladd	Frank F. Harding
Charles H. LaFranchi	Jerry J. Hauter
Kenneth W. Leiding	Douglas J. Hinds
Gordon T. Longerbeam	Louis C. Hines
John W. Lucey	Gerald G. Hooper
Alton P. McKinley, Jr.	Jack L. Jones
Edward A. McMerty	Leland B. Jones

Kenneth L. Lane
Gerald L. Lee
Eugene A. Leeb
William H. Leney
James H. Mayer
Richard C. Moore
Dale R. Mummert
John E. Nelson
Roy B. Opitz
Jared H. Peterson
Earl E. Poorbaugh
David T. Savage, Jr.
James G. Seely, Jr.
Charles A. Smith
Donald L. Sodrel
Frank H. Spaulding
Harrison I. Steans
Matthew A. Stephenson
James B. Stoltzman
Carl E. Stone
Charles E. Storm
Stanley Sulzer
Edward R. VanPatten
Richard W. Walker
James B. Whittaker
Samuel J. Wilder, Jr.
Joseph M. Woods III
William J. Bardin, Jr.
John G. Bauer

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grade indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy

Charles H. Moseley, Jr.
Martin R. Plaut.
Layton R. Sutton.

The following-named Reserve officers to the grade indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy

Martin G. Andersen	James H. Johnson
Nelson E. Bachus	Jack P. McDaniel
Robert E. Ball, Jr.	John A. Most
Jacob V. Brown	Willis S. Myers
Richard A. Buckwalter	James A. Rogers
Frederick G. Coester	Eustine P. Rucci
Biagio A. Conte	Erwin L. Samuelson
Herbert L. Eckert	John R. Stenger
Charles W. Emerick	David L. Stephens
Gerald D. Faulkner	Peter Sternlieb
Robert C. Garcia	Ralph E. Wallace, Jr.
William P. Gibbons	John S. Wilson
John R. Hartman	William R. Winter

The following-named women officer candidates to the grade indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be ensigns in the line of the Navy

Jeannette E. Green.
Doris M. McNabb.
Ida R. Moore.

The following-named person to the grade indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be ensign in the line of the Navy, for temporary service, for limited duty only, classification Ordnance
Rufus B. Moore.

The following-named United States Navy retired officers to the grade indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Lieutenant commander in the line of the Navy, for temporary service, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211
Fredrick R. Barker.
Archibald Gibson.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named (Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent ap-

pointment to the grade indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Second lieutenant in the Marine Corps

Wiley M. Clapp, Jr. Joseph G. Mixson
George V. Ellison John C. Sullivan
Franklin J. Kline

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Claude W. Hughes, Piedmont.

ARKANSAS

Smiley F. Buck, Altus.
Rex F. Jeffery, Calico Rock.
Ashley N. Park, De Valls Bluff.
Celestine B. Finnell, Grubbs.
Claxton Steed, Gurdon.
Leland T. Lewis, Huntsville.
Don C. Jones, Jasper.
Harry Craig, Jonesboro.
Kermit C. Sparks, Lamar.
Lola Mae Eppes, Madison.
Willie J. White, Mount Ida.
Naomi Oleta Hixson, Paris.
John R. Dail, Ravenden.

CALIFORNIA

Stanley A. Powell, Downey.
Eugene E. Timmons, Highgrove.
Marion M. Davis, La Habra.
Llewellyn D. Crandall, Larkspur.
Thearis J. Bohling, Portola.
Walter A. Page, Redlands.
Ruth E. Pratt, Santa Ynez.
Charles W. Lefflingwell, Solano Beach.
Harry S. Clifton, Stateline.
Ernest D. Gibson, Van Nuys.
Walter Lewis, Westminster.
Frank B. Johnson, Westmoreland.
Walter J. Fitzpatrick, Yosemite National Park.

COLORADO

Theodore G. Hefner, Denver.

CONNECTICUT

David C. Hollister, South Glastonbury.

FLORIDA

Ida W. Norris, Branford.
Joel L. Adams, Laurel Hill.
Catherine W. McCormick, Nocatee.

GEORGIA

Henrietta B. Dopson, Jacksonville.
Willard E. Thomas, Lafayette.
Clara Jean S. Bentley, Palmetto.
Thomas B. Williams, Rossville.

IDAHO

Robert L. Bulen, Culesac.
Lavern Cornwall, Inkom.
Floyd K. Heimgartner, Juliaetta.

ILLINOIS

Frank Kelstler, Jr., Anna.
Paul K. Sample, Auburn.
Marion M. Schmidt, Basco.
Laura Z. Coppock, Bloomington.
Harlow D. Snook, Cerro Gordo.
Marjorie M. Herringer, Channahon.
Colette C. Hynes, Crete.
Theodore C. Hegstrom, Dolton.
Guy A. Doyle, Donovan.
Charles H. Harker, Sr., Dunlap.
Raymond D. Manis, Ewing.
Marion C. Palmer, Glen Ellyn.
Louis D. Hobaker, Mackinaw.
William I. Anderson, Metropolis.
Lawrence F. Koelling, Naperville.
Carlton R. Morton, Orea.
Robert A. Saar, Scales Mound.
Chester Bultema, South Holland.
William Henry Fey, Staunton.
Bertha P. Glenn, Verona.
George W. Cross, Woodland.

INDIANA

Ernest Wayne, Mattox, Culver.
Robert L. Sieber, Delphi.
James R. Williams, Elizabethtown.
Herman Funkhouser, Hymers.
Ruth Quillen, Mooresville.
William W. Bishop, Newport.
Bill R. Davidson, Princeton.

Wendell R. Martin, Rensselaer.
Anna Lee Mory, South Milford.
Charles David Keller, Valparaiso.
Merrill R. Dorrell, West Newton.
Philip L. Lauren, Winona Lake.

IOWA

Harry F. Olhausen, Hartley.
Reynolds K. Henrikson, Inwood.
Elmer J. Galloway, Jr., Lone Tree.
Kenneth F. McFarlan, What Cheer.

KANSAS

Violet I. Hallren, Hamilton.
Herbert H. Chittenden, Hays.
Audrey L. Purcell, Leavenworth.
Calvin A. Borrer, Westphalia.

KENTUCKY

Velma A. Houchin, Brownsville.
David Combs, Bulan.
Clara G. Kelly, Combs.
Clark N. Scott, Crab Orchard.
Robert H. Eckler, Dry Ridge.
Velma L. Lane, Flatwoods.
Roy C. Lutes, Florence.
Ina Jean Burnett, Freeburn.
Joseph S. Rhodes, Jr., Frenchburg.
John T. Durham, Greensburg.
Frank L. Coldiron, Greenup.
Lillian F. Lowe, Harold.
James R. Rash, Jr., Henderson.
Nora L. Keyes, Hitchins.
Elmer A. Elliott, Hustonville.
Ida P. Kitchen, McAndrews.
Alva H. Kelley, Madisonville.
Carl H. Biliter, Majestic.
James O. Smith, Mount Vernon.
Clarence R. Johnson, New Haven.
Charles M. Carter, Jr., Scottsville.
Norma L. Rich, Uniontown.
Mervyn E. Allen, Vine Grove.
Eugene Sammons, Worthington.

MAINE

Lewis H. Burr, Kennebunk.
Willis J. Gates, Millinocket.
Milton A. Lisherness, Oquossoc.

MARYLAND

Lillian E. Noll, Woodstock.

MASSACHUSETTS

James E. Elphinstone, Ludlow.
Raymond H. Allen, North Grafton.
Norman V. Joyal, North Oxford.
Nathaniel A. Nash, Oakdale.

MICHIGAN

Dean F. Meier, Byron.
Ralph H. Smith, Flat Rock.
Harold Stecker, Hermansville.
Arthur H. Weitschat, Lake Orion.
Donald D. French, Portland.
George J. Ruff, Rockwood.
Norval L. James, St. Charles.
Thelma H. Swarts, Tipton.
Alma M. McCready, Turner.

MINNESOTA

Neil Hopkins, Villard.

MISSISSIPPI

Mabel E. Burford, Coldwater.
Jack T. Holleman, Houston.
Charles P. Gunter, Marks.
William R. Lea, Minter City.
James William Jones, Newhebron.
Philip L. May, Silver Creek.

MISSOURI

Colin A. Labruey, Bloomsdale.
Ralph Gravely, Bolivar.
Wayne E. Milligan, Buckner.
Ralph E. Mosley, Crocker.
Jakey F. Hobbs, Fair Play.
James D. Edwards, Galena.
Roberta R. Purdy, Glasgow.
Ellis E. Bass, Hartville.
Leo B. Funk, Kirksville.
Donald R. Hoven, Pacific.
George E. Light, Ridgeway.

NEBRASKA

Naomi A. McConkey, Blue Hill.
John Boyd Page, Fairbury.

Osyth M. Stradley, Greenwood.
Arthur Floyd Gowin, Hemingford.

NEVADA

James Donald Morrison, Eureka.

NEW JERSEY

George W. Schuyler, Clinton.
Gertrude N. Bailey, Dividing Creek.
Joseph Kain, Kenvil.
Robert W. Sanders, Middlesex.
John Stothers, Rutherford.
John J. Picknally, Jr., Sea Bright.

NEW MEXICO

Benny J. Daugherty, Holloman Air Force Base.
Everette W. Myers, Tularosa.

NEW YORK

Bruno Gatti, Amawalk.
Peter Hillen, Jr., Amityville.
Patrick L. Agnano, Ardsley.
Herbert Improte, Centereach.
David Samuel Farmer, Cornwall-on-the-Hudson.
Oscar V. Newkirk, Kingston.
Horace E. Wadsworth, Nyack.
Katherine C. Bittner, Shelter Island Heights.
Frederick Burton Fisher, Whiteface.
Justin J. Martin, Willard.

NORTH CAROLINA

James F. Lampley, Cordova.
Leonard R. Odham, Fair Bluff.
Joseph W. Heath, Wade.

NORTH DAKOTA

Normal R. Fuchs, Zap.

OHIO

Dorothy S. Hagelberger, Anna.
Ray W. Coler, Chesterhill.
William R. Davis, Creston.
John E. LePage, Cumberland.
Floyd C. Smothers, Fostoria.
Harold R. Sherck, Genoa.
John Benson Davis, Ironton.
Hazel C. Kelly, Navarre.
Harry E. Bricker, Negley.
John H. Scott, Newcomerstown.
Lell A. Smith, Wheelersburg.
Elvin B. McKay, Wilmington.

OKLAHOMA

Carl R. Junghanns, Medford.
James B. Cox, Tahlequah.

PENNSYLVANIA

Margaret F. Doering, Bethayres.
Edgar R. Baker, Blairsville.
Alvin J. Oldham, California.
Charles V. B. Daugherty, Dallastown.
William M. Crouse, Denver.
Lloyd J. Burket, East Freedom.
Harold Raymond Mitchell, East Smithfield.
Hugh H. Hart, East Waterford.
James W. Hutchison, Elizabeth.
Florence M. Leyerzapf, Glenfield.
Robert A. Krieger, Greentown.
Leo A. Patterson, Homestead.
Mary C. Pratt, Hopwood.
George L. Mosebarger, Johnsonburg.
Anna F. Rorer, Johnsville.
George Costello, Jr., LaBelle.
Arthur Z. Emery, New Berlinville.
John D. Kane, Sr., Phoenixville.
Gladys E. Ackelson, Prospect.
Howard A. Miller, Richfield.
Richard B. Nealer, Robinson.
Ralph B. Derry, Schellsburg.
Ralph A. Pensyl, Shamokin.
Fred G. Haddon, Shamokin Dam.
Miriam T. Hornberger, Talmage.
Harry H. Powell, Sr., Tamaqua.
Lawson Stinson, Thornton.
George Gaylord Bartron, Tunkhannock.
John D. Marshall, Wampum.
Wilson D. Catherman, Warriors Mark.
Leo W. Burr, Washington Crossing.
Mary E. Reagle, Wheatland.
Harry E. Gohn, Wrightsville.
Evelyn Mae Ray, Wyano.

PUERTO RICO

Euclides Pagan Irizarry, Aquadilla.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Arthur L. Hughes, Clifton.
Wade H. Sandifer, Cope.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Merrill G. Peterson, Alpena.
Milton A. Williams, Lead.
Morris F. Broe, Mobridge.
Howard J. Wood, Sioux Falls.

TENNESSEE

Mable F. Harlow, Pulaski.

UTAH

Dean L. Adams, Loa.

VERMONT

Gordon F. W. Eaves, Danby.

VIRGINIA

William E. Ewers, Woodberry Forest.
Thomas C. Wilkins, Wytheville.

WISCONSIN

Charles C. Robb, Arena.
Robert T. Burns, Hollandale.
Robert Addison Hotchkiss, Independence.
Myles Clark, Mauston.
Roger A. Shanks, Merrimac.
Keith G. Cairns, Mount Hope.
Julius C. Sarafolean, Portage.

WYOMING

Harry B. Spargur, Osage.
Joseph H. Whitmore, Wheatland.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate, May 16, 1957:

POSTMASTER

ILLINOIS

William M. Johnson, Granite City.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 16, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, Thou knowest the duties that lie before us this day, the decisions that we will be called upon to make, and the danger and difficulties that may confront us.

We commend and commit ourselves to Thy divine providence, beseeching Thee that Thy gracious spirit may govern our minds and guide them in ways of wisdom and righteousness.

With a humble spirit and a contrite heart we penitently confess that again and again we live too much without Thee, forsaking Thy precepts and commandments and following our own desires and devices.

Grant that daily we may live and labor to strengthen the weak and confirm the strong in their search and struggle to find a larger measure of happiness and blessedness.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and